Vol. IX., No. 33 *March, 1920*

STUDIES

An Irish Quarterly Review

OF

Letters Philosophy & Science

I. THE DEMOCRACY OF S. THOMAS ... ... ALFRED O'RAHILLY
II. THE ECONOMICS OF NATIONALISATION ... ... HENRY SOMERVILLE
III. CITY MANAGEMENT IN AMERICA ... ... JOHN J. HORGAN
IV. PALESTINIAN CUSTOMS AS ILLUSTRATING THE BIBLE... EDMOND POWER
V. TWO BISHOPS OF KILLALOE AND IRISH FREEDOM ... JAMES HOGAN
VI. POETRY—DETACHMENT ... ... JOHN BUNKER
VIATICUM ... ... GEORGE NOBLE PLUNKETT
FROM THE HILLS ... ... W. M. GIBBON
SADHBH ... ... MOIRIN A CHEAVASA
THE KING OF EMAIN ... ... LOLA STEELE-NICHOLSON
VII. UNPUBLISHED IRISH POEMS—NO. 9 ... ... OSBORN BERGIN
VIII. THE BRITISH IN EGYPT ... ... RAPHAEL NAKHLA
IX. SOME UNPUBLISHED MANGAN MSS. ... ... GEORGE O'NEILL
X. CHRONICLE—I. THE NEW PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC C. BAUSSAN
II. GABRIELE D'ANNUNZIO ... ... A. P.
XI. REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

Dublin—The Educational Company of Ireland, Limited
London and St. Louis—B. Herder
Melbourne—William P. Linehan

Price (United Kingdom) 2/6 net *Annual Subscription 10/- post free*
(Foreign Countries) 3/- net *12/-*
(U.S.A. & Canada) 75 cents net. *$3.00*

Selection of Religious Publications.

THE LITTLE BOOK OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. Crown 16mo, 3½ in. x 5 in.; 150 pp.; cloth, 1/-; leather, 2/- net.

THE LITTLE OFFICE OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. 32mo; paper, 1d.

AROUND THE CRIB. Meditations for Christmastide. Adapted from the Italian of Father GIUSEPPE REBAUDENGO. Crown 16mo, 3½ in. x 5 in.; cloth, 1/-; leather, 2/-.

SOME IRISH VINCENTIANS IN CHINA in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By the Rev. PATRICK BOYLE, C.M. Price, 1/-.

UNDER THE CEDARS AND STARS. By Very Rev. P. A. Canon SHEEHAN, D.D. Crown 8vo; cloth, 3/6 net.

MEMOIR OF THE VENERABLE OLIVER PLUNKETT, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, who suffered death for the Catholic Faith in the year 1681. By His Eminence Cardinal MORAN. Crown 8vo; cloth extra, 6/-.

MARY AIKENHEAD: Her Life, Her Work, and Her Friends. With Preface by Most Rev. N. DONNELLY, D.D. Third Edition. Illustrated. 10/6 net.

BROWNE & NOLAN, Ltd., Publishers, 41 & 42 Nassau Street, Dublin.

A. THOM & CO., LIMITED,

SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER,
HUMPHREY & ARMOUR,
SULLIVAN BROTHERS,

Printers, Stationers, and Educational Publishers.

"Studies" is Printed and Bound by us and is a Specimen of our .: Magazine Work. ::

8 & 9 CROW STREET AND 20 & 21 TEMPLE LANE, DUBLIN.

PIGOTT & CO., Limited.

Sole Agents for the Celebrated Pianos by
BROADWOOD, CHAPPELL, CHALLEN, ALLISON, BROOKLYN, PAYNE.

For Cash, Hire or Purchase. :: Write for Price List.

112 Grafton Street, Dublin.

Siopa na Leabhar nGaedhealach.

THE IRISH BOOK SHOP,

45 DAWSON STREET, DUBLIN.

PLEASE WRITE FOR CATALOGUE OF BOOKS ON IRELAND AND OF IRISH INTEREST.

PART I.—WORKS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

An t-aon siopa amain i mBaile-ata-Cliath gur éigin do gach duine fan oifig eólas a beit aige ar teangain na nGaedheal.

"Irish Messenger" Publications.

The **"IRISH MESSENGER"** pamphlets, some 300 in number, include three penny magazines:—1. The **"Messenger"** itself (monthly). 2. **"The Madonna,"** a quarterly magazine devoted to the interests of the Blessed Virgin. 3. The **"Gaelic Messenger,"** a quarterly religious magazine in the Irish language.

The following are the four last pamphlets of the **"Social Action" Series**:—No. 24, **"Social Reconstruction,"** by American Bishops; No. 25, **"The Future of Labour,"** by Rev. J. Kelleher, S.T.L.; No. 26, **"Rural Secondary Schools,"** by Rev. E. Cahill, S.J.; No. 27, **"The Reasonable Limits of State Activity,"** by his Eminence, Cardinal O'Connell.

"IRISH MESSENGER" OFFICE, DUBLIN.

JUST A LITTLE APPLIED PERIODICALLY IS ALL THAT IS REQUIRED TO KEEP FLOORS AND LINOLEUMS BEAUTIFULLY BRIGHT AND CLEAN.

"THE HALL" FLOOR POLISH

Is the best and most economical Polish you can buy.

Sold everywhere in tins at **4½***d.*, **8***d.*, *and* **1***s.* **4***d.*

Made in Dublin by HUGH MOORE & ALEXANDERS.

Maynooth Mission to China.

THIS Irish Mission to China has its College at Dalgan Park, Galway. 300 Students have applied for admission to the College, but we have been obliged to refuse them for want of accommodation. With the greatest difficulty and inconvenience we have provided room for 42 students. We are forced to extend our living space very considerably, and we rely on the Catholic people to assist us. We depend altogether on their charity.

HOW CAN YOU ASSIST?

The best ways for you and for the Mission to China are:

1. Become Promoters of the Irish Mission League;
2. Get and read "THE FAR EAST," our monthly magazine.

Write immediately for all particulars to—

Rev. JOHN BLOWICK,
St. Columban's College,
DALGAN PARK, GALWAY.

By assisting in this work you obtain the following advantages—

1. You get the Apostolic Blessing of Our Holy Father the Pope;
2. You share in 1,500 Masses every year;
3. Mass is offered every morning at St. Columban's for your intentions;
4. Solemn Requiem Mass is offered each year on the 2nd of November, for all deceased benefactors of the Mission;
5. The Office for the dead is said once a month for all deceased benefactors;
6. Special public Prayers are said each day for you.

Write for Particulars and Information at once.

YOUR AID IS URGENTLY NEEDED.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION FOR IRELAND.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE FOR IRELAND.

The Session extends from October to June.

For the Diploma of Associateship of the College a complete course of Instruction, extending over a period of four years, is given in AGRICULTURE and its ALLIED SUBJECTS (including Horticulture, Forestry, and Creamery Management), MECHANICAL and ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING, APPLIED CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, NATURAL SCIENCE, and RURAL SCIENCE (including School Gardening).

A limited number of Entrance Scholarships are offered each year:—

(*a*) In Agriculture and its Allied Subjects.

(*b*) In Science and Technology.

The competitive examination for the award of the Scholarships in Science and Technology is held during the last week of June in each year.

The examination for Scholarships in Agriculture is held during the first week of August each year, and the examination for Entrance to the College in the Faculty of Agriculture is held at the same time.

The examinations for Entrance for all Faculties, other than Agriculture, are held (1) in the last week of June, (2) in the second week of September of each year.

For full particulars of the conditions of Entrance by examination or other qualification, of the examinations for Scholarships, and of the various Courses of Instruction, Fees, etc., may be obtained upon application to

THE REGISTRAR,
ROYAL COLLEGE OF SCIENCE FOR IRELAND,
DUBLIN.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CORK

(*A Constituent College of the National University of Ireland*).

Full Courses for Degrees and Diplomas in

Arts, Celtic Studies, Science, Medicine, Dentistry, Engineering, Commerce, Agriculture, Law, Education, Journalism, Music.

Full particulars as to the Conditions and cost of obtaining these Degrees and Diplomas, with all other information as to the College, its facilities and Scholarships, may be obtained on application to THE REGISTRAR.

The College has a number of valuable SCHOLARSHIPS, full particulars as to which can be obtained gratis, on application to THE REGISTRAR at the College.

The HONAN HOSTEL provides for Catholic Men Students. For Terms apply to THE WARDEN.

A List of recognised Lodgings, approved by the President and the Deans of Residence, is available for the use of parents and guardians.

The College has playing grounds 15 acres in extent, available for all kinds of games.

THE

PATRIOTIC Assurance Company, Ltd.

FIRE, ACCIDENT, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION & BURGLARY.

Registered and Head Office: 9 College Green, DUBLIN.

CAPITAL FULLY PAID £100,000.

DIRECTORS—

JOHN MOONEY, C.V.O., D.L., J.P., Chairman. | PHILIP H. GRIERSON, Esq.
LAURENCE W. MARTIN, Esq. | JOHN SINCLAIR, Esq. (Belfast).
SIR THOMAS HENRY GRATTAN ESMONDE, Bart.

Low Rates of Premium and prompt and liberal Settlement of Claims.

The position of the Company is amply secured independent of Capital.

PROPOSAL FORM AND ALL INFORMATION ON APPLICATION TO COMPANY'S AGENTS, OR TO **STUART C. SMITH, Manager & Secretary.**

THE HIBERNIAN FIRE :: AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED :: ::

HEAD OFFICES: 48 & 49 Dame St., Dublin.
BRANCHES: Dundalk, Belfast, Derry, Cork.

Policies issued cover **Fire, Fidelity Guarantee, Burglary, Third Party,** and :: :: ::

Employers' Liability Risks.

HERDER'S NEW BOOKS.

A MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS.
By the Rev. B. J. OTTEN, S.J. Vol. I.—THE PATRISTIC AGE (100-869); 8vo; 9/6 net. Vol. II.—THE MIDDLE AGES AND AFTER (869-1907); 8vo; 10/6 net.
(Complete in Two Volumes.)

A HANDBOOK OF MORAL THEOLOGY.
By the Rev. A. KOCH, D.D. Edited by A. PREUSS. Vol. I.—GENERAL INTRODUCTION; 8vo; 7/- net. Vol. II.—SIN AND THE MEANS OF GRACE; 8vo; 7/- net.
(To be completed in Five Volumes.)

A COMMENTARY ON THE NEW CANON LAW.
By Dom. P. C. AUGUSTINE, O.S.B., D.D. Vol. I.—INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL RULES (Can. 1-86); 8vo; 6/- net. Vol. II.—CLERGY AND HIERARCHY (Can. 87-486); 8vo; 10/6 net.
(To be completed in about Six Volumes.)

THE STORY OF ST. PATRICK'S PURGATORY.
By SHANE LESLIE; 8vo; 2/6 net.

B. HERDER, PUBLISHER TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE.
68 GT. RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.

THE HIBERNIAN BANK LIMITED.

ESTABLISHED 1825.

Subscribed Capital, 100,000 Shares of £20 each, £2,000,000.

Paid up Capital..... £500,000. | Reserve Fund..... £160,000.

DIRECTORS:

JOHN MURPHY, ESQ., 17 EDEN QUAY, Chairman

JOHN LOUIS SCALLAN, ESQ., 25 SUFFOLK STREET.
THOMAS LEVINS MOORE, ESQ., J.P., ASHTON HOUSE, CASTLEKNOCK.
MATTHEW JOSEPH MINCH, ESQ., J.P., 14 AILESBURY ROAD, DONNYBROOK.
MARTIN FRANCIS MAHONY, ESQ., J.P., ASHTOWN LODGE, CASTLEKNOCK.
PATRICK JOSEPH BRADY, ESQ., GLENA, BOOTERSTOWN.
ALFRED T COLLINS, ESQ., General Manager.

AUDITOR:

JEREMIAH BUCKLEY, ESQ., Chartered Accountant, 46 Dame Street.

HEAD OFFICE—COLLEGE GREEN, DUBLIN.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTORS

Submitted to the Shareholders at their Ordinary General Meeting held on Monday, the 26th day of January, 1920.

The Directors submit herewith the Statement of Accounts for the half-year ending 31st December, 1919.

After providing for rebate on bills, interest on deposits, and bad and doubtful debts and contingencies, the net profits for the half-year amount to ..	£35,164 15 0
To which has to be added — Balance of undivided profits from last Account	12,131 0 3
	£47,295 15 3
The Directors have transferred to the Reserve Fund the sum of	£10,000 0 0
And they recommend that the balance be applied as follows, viz.:—	
In payment of a dividend for the half-year at the rate of Eight per cent. per annum (subject to deduction of Income Tax)	20,000 0 0
To next Account	17,295 15 3
	£47,295 15 3

The Directors retiring by rotation are Mr. JOHN LOUIS SCALLAN and Mr. PATRICK JOSEPH BRADY, who, being eligible, offer themselves for re-election.

In conformity with the provisions of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, it will be necessary for the Shareholders to elect an Auditor for the ensuing year. Mr. JEREMIAH BUCKLEY, the present Auditor, offers himself for re-election.

By Order of the Board,

ALFRED T. COLLINS,
General Manager.

DUBLIN, 12th January, 1920.

THE HIBERNIAN BANK LIMITED.

Dr. BALANCE SHEET, 31st DECEMBER, 1919. Cr.

LIABILITIES.	£ s. d.	ASSETS.	£ s. d.
To Capital, viz.:—100,000 Shares of £20 each—£2,000,000; amount paid up, £5 per Share	500,000 0 0	By Cash in hand and with Bankers ...	1,485,145 10 0
,, Reserve Fund	160,000 0 0	,, Treasury Bills	700,000 0 0
,, Deposit, Current, and other Credit Accounts, including Interest due on Deposits	11,578,101 11 9	,, Investments, viz.:—	
,, Sundry Agents	29,390 6 4	£5,527,235 British Government Securities (War Stocks and Bonds, Consols, Local Loans Stock, and Guaranteed Land Stocks)	
,, Officers' Superannuation Fund (of which £37,980 9s. 7d. is invested as per contra)	42,189 17 5	£280,000 Colonial Government Stocks	
,, Rebate on Bills Discounted not at maturity	5,674 3 7	£150,000 Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co. 3½ per cent. First Mortgage Debenture Stock, 1961 (Guaranteed by the Canadian Government)	6,000,899 17 6
,, Profit and Loss Account £47,295 15 3		£100,000 Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co. 3 per cent. First Mortgage Sterling Bonds, 1962 (Guaranteed by the Canadian Government)	
Less: Transferred to Reserve Fund .. £10,000 0 0		£36,978 Dublin Corporation Stock	
	37,295 15 3	£434,047 Sundry Debenture Stocks, etc.	
			8,186,045 7 6
		,, Investment, a/c Officers' Superannuation Fund:—£40,000 5 per cent. War Stock, 1929-1947 ...	37,980 9 7
		,, Bills Discounted, Advances on Current Accounts, Loans, etc.	3,944,106 13 6
		,, Sundry Agents	41,129 16 1
		,, Bank Premises and Furniture (Head Offices and 53 Branches), written down to	143,389 7 8
	£12,352,651 14 4		£12,352,651 14 4

PROFIT AND LOSS ACCOUNT for Half-year ending 31st December, 1919.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
To Expenses of Management, including Directors' Fees, Salaries, Pensions and Allowances, Bonuses and Grants to Staff, Rent and Taxes, Repairs, Income Tax, and all other outlay ...	63,792 8 5	By Balance from last Account ...	12,131 0 3
,, Amount transferred to Reserve Fund	10,000 0 0	,, Gross Profits for Half-year, after providing for Rebate on Bills, Interest on Deposits, and Bad and Doubtful Debts and Contingencies	98,957 3 5
,, Dividend to be paid in February, 1920, subject to deduction of Income Tax ... £ 20,000 s. 0 d. 0			
,, Balance to next Acct. 17,295 15 3			
	37,295 15 3		
	£111,088 3 8		£111,088 3 8

AUDITOR'S REPORT.

I have obtained all the information and explanations I have required in the course of my examination in detail of the foregoing Profit and Loss Account and Balance Sheet.

I have verified the Investments. Those redeemable at par or over par on fixed dates (including the War Stocks and War Bonds) stand in the Balance Sheet at under cost price, and all the other Investments at the market prices current on 31st December, 1919. I have also verified the Cash and Bills in hand at the Head Office.

The Balance Sheet is, in my opinion, properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the Company's affairs according to the best of my information and the explanations given to me, and as shown by the Books of the Company and the Certified Returns from the several Branches.

JEREMIAH BUCKLEY (KEAN & Co.),
Chartered Accountant, Auditor.

DUBLIN, 12th January, 1920.

JOHN MURPHY,
M. J. MINCH,
PATRICK J. BRADY. } *Directors.*

ALFRED T. COLLINS, *General Manager.*

THE CATHOLIC CHARITIES REVIEW

A Monthly Magazine which Discusses the Facts, Problems and Methods of Charity and Related Social Questions . . .

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: FIVE SHILLINGS.

Rev. JOHN A. RYAN, D.D., LL.D., Editor and Manager,
The Catholic University of America,
WASHINGTON, D.C., U.S.A.

The :: Talbot :: Press
Spring Announcements 1920

Complete New Spring Catalogue may be had from all Booksellers, or on application to Publishers

The Talbot Press Ltd., 89 Talbot St., Dublin and all Booksellers

Modern Ireland in the Making

Two New Volumes in this important Series

The Evolution of Sinn Fein. By ROBERT MITCHELL HENRY, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5/- net.

Professor Henry has written a dispassionate and comprehensive account of the development of Irish Nationalism since the death of Parnell. This well-documented history is objective and critical, but without anti-national bias. The author sees the Irish struggle for self-government steadily. Without a trace of partisanship he has analysed and described the various elements which have governed the evolution of Sinn Fein Ireland.

The Home Rule Movement. By MICHAEL MACDONAGH. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5/- net.

Mr. Michael MacDonagh has surveyed the Home Rule Movement from its origin to the death of John Redmond. Writing at a distance from the heat of current controversies, the author is able to estimate fairly the achievements of the constitutionalists. His pages are livened by many vivid first-hand impressions of striking personalities and important scenes.

An Irishman's History of America

The Making of a Republic. By KEVIN R. O'SHIEL. Crown 8vo, 3/6 net.

Writing as an Irish republican, Mr. O'Shiel has made a survey of the American struggle against England for independence, which has a special interest for Irishmen to-day.

Poetry and Drama

Ulster Songs and Ballads. By PADRIC GREGORY. Crown 8vo, 2/6 net.

In this new collection of his songs and ballads, Mr. Padric Gregory's talent is shown in its varied richness. Echoes of an elder world are heard in these pages, where Ulster tradition and folk song find in this gifted singer a masterly exponent.

Fragments. By A. E. GREEN. Crown 8vo, 4/6 net.

These poems by a new writer have the distinction given by real thought, born of emotion and lit with a glow of colour. Mr. A. E. Green's verses have a vigour and spontaneity which reveal the gifts of a true poet.

The Dragon. A Kiltartan Wonder Play in 3 Acts. By LADY GREGORY. Crown 8vo, 3/6 net.

Readers of *The Golden Apple* will welcome the appearance in book form of Lady Gregory's second wonder play, for children of all ages. Lady Gregory invests the scenes from the fantastic fairyland of childhood with the same happy humour and imagination as are characteristic of her delightful Kiltartan comedies.

The Talbot Press Booklets

The Shadow of the Rose. By J. BERNARD MCCARTHY. Paper cover, 1/- net.

A selection from the verses of a Cork writer, already well-known as one of the group of Munster playwrights.

Songs on Freedom's Eve. By AODH DE BLÁCAM. Paper cover, 1/- net.

The wide public to which Mr. de Blácam's prose writings have so justly appealed will welcome this selection of Irish and English poems from his pen.

Fiction

Pirates of the Spring. By FORREST REID. Cr. 8vo, cloth, 7/- net.

This is a story of boyhood and youth, written with all the skill of the author's experienced craftsmanship. Mr. Forrest Reid is not a sentimentalist, intent upon mawkish idealisation. Nor is he a propagandist with a message for educational reformers. He is a delicate psychologist and a sympathetic delineator of young life. Above all he is a stylist and a story-teller of distinction.

Eight Short Stories. By LENNOX ROBINSON. Crown 8vo, 3/6 net.

That Mr. Lennox Robinson has the true gift of story-telling is evident from the scope and power of the stories here collected. Mystery, realism, and imagination have full play in such tales as "A Pair of Muddy Shoes," "The Sponge," and "The Weir." This is a book which stands out clearly amongst the numerous volumes of conventionally Irish short stories.

[*Advt. by The Talbot Press Limited Dublin*]

THE CATHOLIC WORLD

FIFTY-FOURTH YEAR.

The Oldest Catholic Magazine in the United States.

ESTABLISHED APRIL, 1865.

Catholic thought on the living questions of the day finds its best expression in THE CATHOLIC WORLD.

The Leading Writers of America contribute to its pages.

Every issue commands the attention of the literary world and merits the careful reading of every thoughtful Catholic.

Something is lacking in the Catholic home which does not receive THE CATHOLIC WORLD.

His Holiness, Pope Benedict XV., has but lately honoured THE CATHOLIC WORLD by this special praise:

"It has, during fifty-three years of uninterrupted labour, accomplished a noble and holy apostolate in defence of the Church and of Christian civilization."

A line or two of very recent comment will further show its value:

"For infinite variety and value the contents of THE CATHOLIC WORLD are second to none. . . . . The excellent judgment of its editors can always be safely depended upon to present contributions of intense interest and profit."—*Boston Pilot*, April 7, 1917.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: THREE DOLLARS.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD,

120-122 WEST 60th STREET, NEW YORK.

Readers of "STUDIES" are especially invited to send for a Free Sample Copy.

RECONSTRUCTION IN IRELAND.

RECONSTRUCTION IN IRELAND and the Development of the Nation's Industries are impossible without up-to-date means of transport. The Motor Vehicle for passenger and goods service has come to stay. It has proved itself a reliable and economical means of conveyance, and the only thing left is to make sure of buying the right vehicle. We have years of experience in this work, and have secured Agencies for the best Petrol and Steam Vehicles. You are welcome to the benefit of our advice and experience in choosing the best car or lorry for your business. Why not write to us **NOW ?**

Thompson's Motor Car Co.

LIMITED,

Great Brunswick Street, DUBLIN,

And at BELFAST and CORK.

Showrooms: 3 Lincoln Place, Westland Row Dublin.

Collapsible Hoods fitted to our Tub or Tonneau Cars.

See Our New All-Weather Tonneau Car.

Gold Medal for Cars at Franco-British Exhibition.

Catalogue from Works: Edenderry, King's Co.

Alesbury Bros., Car Builders.

Two Standard Text Books of The "Wibberley" Farming System.

"FARMING ON FACTORY LINES,"

OR

Continuous Cropping for Large Farmers

BY

T. WIBBERLEY, N.D.A., N.D.D.

Second Edition. Price, **6**/- net. (Postage 4d. extra).

A new and frankly revolutionary guide to **ALL-WEATHER FARMING**, and to Cheaper Milk, Corn, and Beef Production.

The Book that has broken all Sale Records of Agricultural Text Books.

CONTINUOUS CROPPING

And Tillage Dairy Farming for Small Farmers, etc.

By T. WIBBERLEY.

Third Edition, Crown 8vo. Cloth. Price, **3**/**6** net; post free 3/10.

The Selborne Agricultural Commission recommend:

"That several farms should be run on **Continuous Cropping Lines** as Demonstration Farms."

These volumes may be obtained through any Bookseller, or direct from the Publishers,

C. Arthur Pearson, Ltd. (Dept. S.S.), Henrietta St., London, W.C. 2.

For THE AMATEUR PHOTOGRAPHER.

Films, Plates, Papers, Developers, Cameras, Developing and Printing.

LISTS FREE.

Keogh BROS LTD

75 LR. DORSET STREET and 124 STEPHEN'S GREEN, DUBLIN.

(Next College of Surgeons.)

VOL. IX. No. 33.

STUDIES

An Irish Quarterly Review

OF

Letters Philosophy & Science

MARCH. 1920

CONTENTS.

		PAGE
I.	THE DEMOCRACY OF S. THOMAS. *Professor Alfred O'Rahilly, M.A.*	1
II.	THE ECONOMICS OF NATIONALISATION. *Henry Somerville, M.A.*	20
III.	CITY MANAGEMENT IN AMERICA. ... ... *John J. Horgan*	41
IV.	PALESTINIAN CUSTOMS AS ILLUSTRATING THE BIBLE. *Edmond Power, S.J., D.Litt.*	56
V.	TWO BISHOPS OF KILLALOE AND IRISH FREEDOM. *James Hogan*	70
VI.	POETRY—DETACHMENT. ... ... *John Bunker*	94
	VIATICUM. ... ... *George Noble Plunkett*	94
	FROM THE HILLS ... ... *W. M. Gibbon*	95
	SADHBH. ... ... *Movrin A Cheavasa*	95
	THE KING OF EMAIN. ... ... *Lola Steele-Nicholson*	96
VII.	UNPUBLISHED IRISH POEMS—No. 9. ... *Professor Osborn Bergin, Ph.D.*	97
VIII.	THE BRITISH IN EGYPT. ... ... *Raphael Nakhla*	101
IX.	SOME UNPUBLISHED MANGAN MSS. *Professor George O'Neill, S.J., M.A.*	118
X.	CHRONICLE—1. THE NEW PRESIDENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC. *Charles Baussan*	129
	II. GABRIELE D'ANNUNZIO. ... ... *A. P.*	134
XI.	REVIEWS OF BOOKS:	

Father William Doyle, S.J., p. 137.—John Redmond's Last Years, p. 139.—The Ichneutae of Sophocles, p. 142.—The Life and Reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus, p. 144.—The Gael, p. 146.—Mount Music, p. 148.—The Golden Barque, The Weaver's Grave, The Leprechaun of Killmeen, p. 150.—Dansons la Trompeuse, p. 151.—The Economic History of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century, p. 152.—The Charters of the Cistercian Abbey of Duiske, p. 155.—The Cistercians in Yorkshire, p. 156.—Songs of the Island Queen, Days and Destinies, Poems of Mary Frances McHugh, The Three Rock Road, p. 158.—Three Days, p. 159.—Ireland in Fiction, p. 161.—New Voices, p. 162.—Scientific Factory Management, p. 165.—Employment Psychology, p. 165.—Inflation, p. 167.—The Paper Pound of 1797–1821, p. 167.—The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Earner, p. 169.—The Soul of Ireland, p. 170.—La Civilisation française, p. 171.—L'Ame de France, p. 173.—La Civilisation française, p. 173.—The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola, p. 175.

☞ STUDIES is published in the months of March, June, September and December.

The price of single Copies is Half-a-Crown net. (Foreign Countries, 3s. net.)

The yearly subscription is Ten Shillings, post free. (Foreign Countries, 12s., post free; U.S.A. and Canada, $3.00 post free.)

The Editorial Offices of STUDIES are at No. 35 Lower Leeson Street, Dublin.

What Every Farmer Wants!

EVERY Farmer who becomes possessed of a Copy of HUNTER'S FARM SEED CATALOGUE for 1920 has a real guide and friendly counsellor in the matter of Seed Selection.

Recognised by all competent authorities as the Standard Work on seeds, Hunter's Farm Seed Catalogue is the *one* book which every practical and Progressive Farmer wants and *must have.*

The 1920 Edition is big—bigger and more informative and valuable than ever. The demand is also bigger than ever.

A COPY IS YOURS FREE FOR THE ASKING.

We have printed more than ever, but the eagerness of Farmers to possess a copy makes it necessary, on account of the heavy cost of production, that you should apply for your copy *NOW.*

Better be safe than disappointed. Send your name and address—while you think of it—to

JAMES HUNTER, Limited,

Farm Seed Specialists,

CHESTER.

THE DEMOCRACY OF S. THOMAS.

BY PROFESSOR ALFRED O'RAHILLY, M.A.

"A CHURCHMAN like Thomas Aquinas," declares a distinguished contemporary historian,[1] "approaches nearer to the opinions of modern times than the generality of those who defended the claims of the emperor as against the pope, by a theory of the necessary, the indefeasible, the divine, basis of the imperial dignity." "Though a strong papalist," says Dr. A. J. Carlyle,[2] "there is no trace in his writings of the mere partisan, and nothing is perhaps more remarkable than the entire absence of all trace of personal feeling in a man whose early life was passed in times of such violent conflict and in which his family suffered much."

These two chance-selected general appreciations will serve as an introduction to a brief study of some of the political and social ideals expounded by the great Dominican, which are still of significance and interest after the lapse of nearly seven centuries. We shall not indeed find in S. Thomas that systematic treatment and wealth of detail which characterized the seventeenth century Schoolmen such as Azpilcueta, Bannez, Molina, Suarez and Lessius. Political questions he treated only incidentally[3] and social issues were dealt with mainly in

[1] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought*, 1884, p. 245.

[2] "The Political Theories of S. Thomas Aquinas"—*Scottish Review* 27 (1896) 129.

[3] It is generally admitted that the treatise *De regimine principum* is authentic as far as ii. 4, the remainder being probably by Tolomeo of Lucca; *cf.* Zeiller, *L'idée de l'état dans S. Thomas*, 1911, pp. 5-11. But J. Endres has recently thrown doubt on Aquinas's authorship of any portion.—Bäumker's Beiträge, *Supplementband*, 1913, pp. 261-267. The authentic portion of the Commentary on Aristotle's

what he designed to be merely an elementary textbook for beginners at theology. Yet that textbook, the *Summa Theologica*, is the world's masterpiece in divinity, unrivalled in clear cogency and conciseness, and has through its array of great commentators exerted a unique influence on the subsequent history of philosophy and theology. Hence the few germs or seed-thoughts planted by S. Thomas were able to achieve a wonderful development and fecundity; it was out of his short sections *de legibus* and *de justitia* that the later and fuller Scholastic treatises grew.[1] Moreover, apart from their historical influence, there is at the present day a peculiar appropriateness in the ideals of S. Thomas and his followers. Not only do we owe to him the incorporation into European political thought of those Aristotelian terms and concepts which are now regarded as commonplace or axiomatic; but never before in the intervening centuries have there been such widespread symptoms of a return to his chief political theories.[2] During his lifetime the Empire was in its last decline—it may indeed be said to have expired with Frederick II. under whom two of his brothers held high command—and the French and English monarchies were rising; he lived, like ourselves, at the parting of the ways. He is democratic and living precisely because he takes no account of the inclusive

Politics stops at iii. 6, the rest being probably by Peter of Auvergne. How far in these Commentaries Thomas is voicing his own views, how far he merely reproduces Aristotle's opinions, is very much debated, particularly on the question of slavery. See Zeiller, p. 3; Talamo, *Il concetto della schiavitù da Aristotele ai dottori scolastici*, 1908, pp. 158*ff*. I made some observations on the Commentaries of Albertus in STUDIES, Sept. 1913, p. 320*f*.

[1] We can see clearly, *e.g.*, in the case of Peter of Aragon (†1584) and Dominic Bannez (†1604), that the treatises *de iure et iustitia* began as commentaries on 2·2, q. 57-q. 78. Similarly many of the earlier *tractatus de legibus*, *e.g.*, that of John de Salas (†1612), originated as commentaries on 1·2, q. 90-q. 98.

[2] Compare the remark of a writer in the *Church Socialist*, Jan., 1918, pp. 16*f*. "In this matter, as in many others, Guildsmen are—sometimes *malgré eux*—medievalists, working back to medieval conceptions from the modern political theory which started definitely with Bodin and reached its strange triple culmination in the democracy of Rousseau, the monarchism of Hegel, and the pedantic legalism of the English Austinians."

imperial conception which the world was destined to outgrow. He is modern and helpful especially because he lays no stress on the idea of the absolute and sovereign State, whose birth-throes he dimly glimpsed and whose demise many of us are beginning vaguely to anticipate.[1]

Even in those matters wherein it has hitherto been the fashion to regard writers like S. Thomas as obscurantist and illiberal, it is now possible to discern a far deeper and more vital issue than Montesquieu's much-vaunted separation of powers. The separate allocation of delegated functions—judicial, legislative, and executive—is now seen to be of little help to liberty, it is merely an example of the economic law of the division of labour. The really important principle is not the separation of powers among different functionaries, but the division of power between authorities of different nature. This was precisely the central issue in the medieval struggle between Church and State. When we think of papal power, of investitures, of clerical immunities, of interdicts, tithes, establishments, concordats and such like, we are tempted to regard them as largely of ecclesiastical or antiquarian interest. That is because we do not look beneath the historical forms in which the principle was asserted and solutions formulated. In politically interpreting this perennial struggle we are not concerned with the Church as a divine society, we may regard it in its purely natural aspect as a social institution, as a working, world-wide organization which upholds the primary truths of human personality and asserts man's right to spiritual freedom. In a world where the divine claims of Christ are rejected, where the supernatural mission of the society He founded is treated as an effete superstition, the Church can and must maintain its existence on grounds of strictly natural right. Seen in this light, the Catholic Church stands forth as

[1] Being a native of Italy, the home of municipal and republican civilisation, he stops preferably at the city, as did Aristotle. Still he did not altogether omit the "province"—a kingdom approaching a modern State or a great fief like the Duchy of Normandy.

the great champion of co-operative liberty and corporate life, the spiritual leader and progenitor of all those associations—family, school, guild, trade-union, charitable society—which the modern bureaucratic State has striven and is striving to crush and destroy. Furthermore, the Church, viewed as the custodian of our moral ideals, asserting its independence of the possessors of brute force, is the unique embodiment of that principle of the division of power which, though Montesquieu missed it, is vital for human liberty. Even Labour, let us not forget, must aim at political power and must be prepared for economic warfare and physical struggle. And if we learn aught from the middle-class revolutions of the past, we must candidly admit that in the proletarian revolts of the future we shall still have need of a moral arbiter independent of the wielders of physical force. As a matter of historical fact, there has never been such apart from the Catholic Church.

These general remarks are necessary in any consideration, however brief, of the democratic ideals of a Churchman such as S. Thomas. They serve to weaken the assiduously fostered prejudice that a medieval ecclesiastical writer is necessarily engaged in a selfish sectarian struggle in which no perennial principles of right are discoverable. Whereas S. Thomas is a very up-to-date crusader indeed, whose political principles not only safeguard democratic liberty and organization but also uphold all the finer elements of civilization against militarism and capitalism. The Church whose claims he defended is the first-born of all the institutions of freedom and culture; its fate is really the concern of us all. It is true that many of what we may call her accidental claims have been broken into small change and distributed among the masses. Time was when the Church was practically the sole safeguard of justice and learning. But nowadays universities are not chartered by the pope, and clerks are not clerics; literature and

philosophy seem hardly to require the shelter of the sanctuary; the trade-guilds need not now be religious confraternities. Yet while admitting this let us not miss the further significant fact that all these forces and institutions—the *disjecta membra*, as it were, of the medieval Church—are making against the secularist absolutist State precisely that same struggle for autonomy and freedom which is portrayed in the pages of Thomas Aquinas.

Generalised and translated into modern terms, his view may be thus expressed. Every community which, as a fact of social psychology, acts as a moral whole—aided thereto by common race, tradition, language, religion or customs—is a complete society. For purposes of public order and international adjustment, it requires an organization known as the State. But this organization is a very incomplete and imperfect expression of the community or nation; it has no claim whatever to an entire monopoly of its human life and culture. "Man is not referred to the political community according to his whole self and all that he has."[1] With which dictum we may contrast the position of a contemporary philosopher, according to whom the State exists "for the special task of maintaining in a certain territory the external conditions of good life *as a whole*" and is the "*sole* organiser of rights and guardian of moral values."[2] This is correctly stated to represent "the Greek tradition as renewed by Hegel and by English thought," for it certainly contradicts the Catholic view; statolatry is very ancient and very modern, but it is not medieval; it can be found in Plato or in Hegel, there is not a trace of it in S. Thomas. For him there is an objective norm of right and wrong, not simply a set of abstract propositions but truths and canons upheld by a living autonomous institution, whereby the State itself is to be judged.

[1] 1·2, q. 21, a. 4, ad. 3.

[2] B. Bosanquet, *Social and International Ideals*, 1917, pp. 283*f*, 270.

"Public power is committed to rulers that they may be the custodians of justice." "Man is bound to obey secular rulers only in so far as the order of justice requires."[1] The State has a limited authority to represent the community in certain aspects, and those not the deepest; outside this ambit its action is *ultra vires*, and within it its conduct is subject to moral criteria. There could be no greater contrast to the current theory of sovereignty, whether held by philosophers, so-called constitutional lawyers or collectivist Socialists.

This emerges more closely from S. Thomas's remarks on legalized injustice. Laws, he says, are unjust in two ways.[2]

(1) Because contrary to human good:

(*a*) From their object—for instance when a government imposes on subjects burdensome laws which are not connected with the common utility but rather with its own cupidity or glory.

(*b*) From their author, as when anyone enacts a law outside the powers committed to him.

(*c*) From their form—for example when burdens, even those ordained for the common good, are imposed unequally on the people.

These are rather acts of violence than laws. . . . Hence such laws have no obligation in conscience—unless perhaps for the avoidance of scandal or disturbance a man ought not to press his rights.

(2) Laws can also be unjust, because contrary to divine good—*e.g.*, the laws of tyrants prescribing idolatry or anything else against the divine law. It is absolutely illicit to observe such laws.

In all this the emphasis is laid on the invalidity of laws which are contrary to human good; and even in the second possibility of injustice—contrariety to divine good—the reference is to natural religion. So far was this theory of State-limitation from being intended as a buttress to the Church, that it is admitted to be equally applicable to ecclesiastical and secular laws.[3] The

[1] 2·2, q. 66, a. 8; 2·2, q. 104, a. 6, ad. 3. [2] 1·2, q. 96, a. 4.

[3] "An unjust civil law does not oblige, hence neither does an unjust ecclesiastical law."—Victoria, *Relect. theol.* iv. 18.

essential point is that every system of government is simply a means for securing the common good within a certain sphere; if it is perverted from this end it ceases to be a government binding in conscience and becomes a tyranny resting on physical force, resistance to which is a matter not for theoretical philosophy but for practical calculation. "A tyrannical government is not just, for it is worked not for the common good but for the private good of those governing. Hence to disturb such a government is not equivalent to sedition—unless perhaps when the tyrannical government is inordinately disturbed so that the people suffer more harm from the disturbance than from the tyranny. It is rather the tyrant that is seditious."[1] S. Thomas saw clearly that "sedition" is sometimes just a question of vocabulary. There are cases when the community is perfectly justified in seeking—and may even be bound to seek—by every effective means to oust an organised tyranny which has usurped the names of "government," "law" and "order" and has monopolized the charge of "sedition."

S. Thomas, however, does not confine himself to this extreme case which is the dissolution of all rule. He gives positive suggestions for obviating its occurrence.

> Every effort should be made [he says [2]] to safeguard the people so that the ruler may not become a tyrant.
>
> (1) It is necessary that only a man whose degeneracy into tyranny is improbable should be made ruler by those to whom the office pertains. . . .
>
> (2) The government should be so arranged that there is no chance of tyranny left for a ruler already established; also his power should be so limited that he cannot easily lapse into tyranny. . . . .
>
> (3) Finally it should be settled how the case could be met if the ruler were to become tyrannical.

It is obvious that such advice could have been penned

[1] 2.2, q. 42, a. 2, ad. 3. In his commentary on the *Politics* (v. 1) he says: "If men have both a just cause and the power, and if the common good does not suffer, they would be right in promoting sedition and *they would sin if they did not do so.*"

[2] *De reg. princ.*, i. 6; Fretté 27, 342*f*. *Cf.* 1.2, q. 105, a. 1, ad. 2.

only by one who was an enemy to all autocracy whether regal or parliamentary. S. Thomas has in fact left us in no doubt concerning his ideal of government. This is his sketch of "the best arrangement of rulers in any city or kingdom."[1]

One man is according to merit set at the head to preside over all, and under him are other rulers according to merit. Yet such a régime is the concern of all, because the rulers are not only elected from all but also are elected by all. Such is every good polity combining monarchy inasmuch as one is at the head, aristocracy inasmuch as there are many rulers [elected] according to merit, and democracy, *i.e.*, the power of the people, inasmuch as the rulers can be elected by the masses and the election of rulers is the business of the people.

This is surely a very uncompromising championship of democracy: *Ad populum pertinet electio principum.* And it is by no means an isolated dictum of S. Thomas.[2] There are many clear indications that he believed in the sovereignty of the people. Thus he holds that government, like private property, "was introduced by the *jus gentium* which is human law."[3] And concerning this so-called *jus gentium*—we might translate it people's right—he tells us that it is "by human agreement" and that men "consented easily" to its provisions.[4] "If then," concludes an able modern commentator,[5]

[1] 1.2, q. 105, a. 1. I have translated *secundum virtutem*—the Aristotelian κατ' ἀξίαν—by "according to merit."

[2] "When I began to read Catholic books," says Cardinal Manning (Purcell, *Life* ii., 630), "I found S. Thomas saying, *Reges propter regna, non regna propter reges.* And again that 'God gives sovereignty immediately to society and mediately (*mediante societate*) to the prince, president or consul, one or more, whom society may legitimately designate.'" I have been unable to discover either quotation in S. Thomas. In *De reg. princ.* iii. 11 the sentence occurs: *Regnum non est propter regem sed rex propter regnum.*

[3] Dominium introductum est de iure gentium quod est ius humanum.—2.2, q. 12, a. 2. Dominium et praelatio introducta sunt ex iure humano.—2.2, q. 10, a. 10.

[4] Secundum humanum condictum.—2.2, q. 66, a. 2, ad. 1. De facili in huiusmodi homines consenserunt.—1.2, q. 95, a. 4, ad. 1. This raises the very important point of the meaning of the Scholastic term *ius gentium*, with which I propose to deal elsewhere.

[5] Père Schwalm O.P., *Leçons de philosophie sociale*, ii. 482. Owing to his mistaken interpretation of an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. (*cf.* STUDIES, March, 1918, p. 9), Pére Schwalm essays to read into S. Thomas the theory of "designation."

"S. Thomas holds that the designation of the holder of power is by the right of peoples, he holds that it is accomplished by the consent of men, and this is the elective principle." So axiomatic is this to S. Thomas that he only admits one exception, the people of Israel. "That people," he says,[1] "was ruled by God's special care. . . And hence the Lord did not entrust even the election of the king to the people but reserved it to Himself."

S. Thomas's argument would seem to be this[2]:—

Primarily and principally law relates to order for the common good. But to order anything for the common good is the function of either of the whole people or of someone taking the place of the whole people. Therefore law-making pertains either to the whole people or to the public person who has charge of the whole people. For, as in everything else, to order for an end is the function of the being whose end it is.

The language might certainly be less ambiguous. But the commentators are unanimous in interpreting the passage to imply that political power resides primarily in the community and secondarily in one to whom the community has transferred the power and who is therefore the people's vicegerent.[3] This is confirmed by what S. Thomas says elsewhere. "In the case of a free people which can make law for itself," he remarks,[4] the consent of the whole people for some observance, as

---

[1] 1.2, q. 105, a. 1, ad. 1.

[2] 1.2, q. 90, a. 3. This is Cajetan's comment (*Opera S. Thomae*, Leonine ed. vii. 151): Seclusa namque divina lege, in multitudine generis humani nullus est princeps; sed ipsa multitudo commune bonum primo respicit per seipsam vel committit alteri; alioquin non princeps sed tyrannus esset qui multitudini praeesset. Every commentator I have read—I examined more than thirty—takes the same view. Compare also Cajetan on 2.2, q. 50, a. 1 (viii. 375): Regimen autem regium a populi quidem electione dependet, qui vota sua et potestatem in eum transtulerunt, et propterea vices populi gerere dicitur.

[3] The argument can be put thus. It is the function of a rational entity to take means towards its end. Therefore, as a particular case, it is the function of the community to enact laws for its good. And the community may for this purpose entrust its power to a vicegerent (*gerens vicem totius multitudinis*). Compare what S. Thomas says concerning the people's responsibility: Maiores omnia faciunt auctoritate et favore populi, et sic populus in favendo maioribus fuit in culpa.—*Quodl.* 12, a. 23, ad. 1.

[4] 1.2, q. 97, a. 3, ad. 3.

shown by custom, is greater than the authority of the ruler, who possesses legislative power only in so far as he represents the people. Hence, although individually the people cannot make law, they can do so as a whole."

To this very clear pronouncement it has been objected by some modern Scholastics that by 'a free people' S. Thomas meant a direct democracy or at least a republic and that only in such a case does he suppose power to reside in the people. To this objection, however, there are two decisive replies. In the first place, the phrases which S. Thomas uses here to characterize the function and position of the ruler (*princeps*) are precisely those which he consistently applies to an ordinary monarchical government. In the second place, it is easily shown that by 'a free people' is meant simply an autonomous political community. For S. Thomas always contrasts therewith a people having a higher superior, an expression which, in the circumstances of the thirteenth century compromise between feudalism and monarchy, aptly describes a partial or subordinate political community. Hence it is that S. Thomas recognises only two legitimate sources of political power: the will of the people or the authority of a superior or over-lord.[1] Thus he says that "when anyone seizes by force on the government, against the will or with the forced consent of the subjects, and when recourse cannot be had to a superior for a decision as to the usurper, then the man who, in order to free his country, slays the tyrant, deserves praise and reward."[2] Similarly in his more elaborate discussion of the right of resistance:

If any people has the right of providing a ruler for itself, then after his appointment the ruler can be justly deposed by the same people or his power may be checked, if he tyrannically abuses his power. Nor should such a people be regarded as disloyal in deposing the tyrant, even if it had previously submitted itself for ever to him. For inasmuch as he did not behave faithfully in his

[1] 2 *Sent.*, d. 44, q. 2, a. 2: vel per consensum subditorum vel per auctoritatem superioris.

[2] *Ibid.*, ad. 5.

rule as his office requires, he did not deserve that the pact with him should be kept by the subjects. . . But if it is the right of some superior to provide a ruler for the people, it is from him that a remedy must be expected against the tyrant's wickedness.[1]

This interesting passage expresses without ambiguity S. Thomas's view that all government is contractual or fiduciary and ultimately revocable by the people, and that even under a monarchy the community has not so transferred its authority that it does not retain very real power. This is what he calls 'a free people,' not in contrast to a people which has slavishly alienated all its power to an assembly or person (a type of government which he did not consider rational)[2] but rather as distinguished from a sub-community, one of those largely autonomous aggregations—duchy, fief, or town—which were commoner in the federalistic society of the middle ages than they are in these days of centralized despotism. This interpretation will also enable us to dispose of an objection which is based on a passage of the *Summa*,[3] wherein he says that "if a people is moderate, serious and carefully observant of the common utility, it is rightly established by law that such a people may create for itself magistrates for its administration," whereas if it is venal and corrupt it should be deprived of such power. "Whatever be the correct interpretation," says Dr. Carlyle,[4] "S. Thomas would certainly seem to indicate that the consent of the subjects is not always required to make a government lawful." A conclusion which is quite true for *local* government. And even if S. Thomas is referring to a politically autonomous people, his argu-

[1] *De reg. principum* i. 6; Fretté 27, 343*b*. Fretté and other editors read *destrui*, but the correct reading seems to be *destitui*.—Zeiller, p. 40. I have translated *rex* as ruler; it would be incongruous to assign a 'superior' to a modern 'king.'

[2] Thus he says (*Pol.* ii. 17; Fretté 26, 202*b*): "Solon gave to the people only that power which is most necessary, namely, that of electing rulers and correcting their mistakes. He says this power of the people is necessary, for without it the people would be slaves—if rulers could be set up without their consent and if they could not remedy the evils which the rulers might do."

[3] 1.2, q. 97, a. 1.

[4] *Scottish Review*, 27 (1896) 138.

ment is that "different [polities] are expedient according to men's different conditions," that a democratic régime is unsuitable to a corrupt and unenlightened people; which is a very different proposition from the denial of the democratic basis of *every* form of government.[1] It is simply one of the many examples of S. Thomas's sturdy common sense and close contact with historical realities. "Justice," he says, "must indeed be always observed; but the determination of what is just must vary according to men's different states;" even "what is of natural law is diversified according to men's diverse states and conditions."[2] "In making laws," he holds, "men should not seek what was observed by their ancestors but what ought to be observed as good; hence it is advisable that old laws should be repealed if better ones are presented."[3] But while thus making full allowance for progress, he, with that sane human kindliness which characterizes the best moral theologians, never forgot the nature of the human material on which legislation has to work. "The polity does not make men," he remarks,[4] "it receives them ready-made from nature and only thus does it make use of them." "Human law," he declares elsewhere,[5] "is for people among whom many are lacking

[1] It is worth noticing that though S. Thomas is really quoting S. Augustine [*De libero arbitrio* i. 6, 14; Migne P.L. 32, 1229], he modifies and tones down the original. S. Augustine says: Nonne item recte, si quis tunc exstiterit vir bonus qui plurimum possit, adimat huic populo potestatem dandi honores et in paucorum bonorum vel etiam unius redigat arbitrium? Which S. Thomas changes into: Recte adimitur populo tali potestas dandi honores et ad paucorum bonorum redit arbitrium. That S. Augustine's passing reference to the "vir bonus" is capable of very dangerous distortion, is shown by the use which anti-democratic writers made of it. Thus, De Dominis: Non igitur Augustino semper tyrannus est qui privata sua potestate eripit populo libertatem.—*De rep. eccles*, vi. 2, 20.

[2] 1.2, q. 104, a. 3, ad. 1; *Suppl.* q. 41, a. 1, ad. 3.

[3] *Pol.* ii. 12. See also 1.2, q. 97, a. 1: Primi qui intenderunt invenire aliquid utile communitati hominum, non valentes omnia considerare, instituerunt quaedam imperfecta in multis deficientia, quae posteriores mutaverunt.

[4] *Pol.* i. 8.

[5] 2.2, q. 77, a. 1, ad. 1 Also 1.2, q. 96, a. 2, ad. 2: Lex humana intendit homines inducere ad virtutem, *non subito sed gradatim.* 1.2, q. 98, a. 2, ad. 1: Nihil prohibet aliquid non esse perfectum simpliciter quod tamen est perfectum secundum tempus.

in virtue, yet it is not intended solely for the virtuous. Hence human law could not prohibit everything that is contrary to virtue; it suffices for it to prohibit what is destructive of social existence." This perhaps explains why S. Thomas implies—if such be the meaning of his almost casual remark—that a democracy which results in hopeless venality and graft should be "deprived of its power of giving honours," lest it prove the undoing of society.

This last objection concerning what Aquinas, using a phrase of S. Augustine's, calls the *potestas dandi honores*, really opens up a very big question which involves a real distinction between the medieval and the modern conception of democracy. This lies in the interpretation of "equality." In the eighteenth century the claims to equality—as used, for instance, in the American and French Revolutions—seems to have meant merely equality of burdens and abolition of special exemptions. Nowadays the idea of equality is made much more positive and comprehensive; it has come, in practice, to imply that men's opinions in public affairs are of equal value. So much so, that a shrewd observer has remarked that "the disregard of special fitness, combined with unwillingness to acknowledge that there can be anything special about any man, which is born of equality, constitutes the great defect of modern democracy."[1] No doubt, the problem has been to a certain extent faced. Non-elective elements of government have either been retained, for instance, the English House of Lords, which in theory consists of men of experience and ability; or have been actually introduced, for example, the competitive system for the civil service. If in the light of these experiences we turn back to S. Thomas's remark, which has been supposed to show lack of faith in the principle of government by consent, we shall see that it is peculiarly appropriate to modern conditions. "If people," he says,

[1] E.L. Godkin, *Unforeseen Tendencies of Democracy*, p. 46.

"gradually grow depraved, sell their votes, and entrust the administration to the vicious and unworthy, such people are rightly deprived of their power of bestowing offices, and this is restored to the decision of a select body of good men." Which is a very accurate description of, say, the Civil Service Commission. But while this latter is really an anomalous exception to the current conception of equality, it is quite consonant with the medieval view.

That all men are naturally equal is a commonplace of the Schoolmen.[1] And they meant by this natural equality something very definite, logical and practical, utterly unlike the slipshod sentimentalism which nowadays attaches to the phrase. "In what pertains to the interior motion of the will," says S. Thomas,[2] "man is not bound to obey man but only God. However, man is bound to obey man in the external bodily actions; but even in such of these as refer to the nature of the body—for example whatever concerns the nourishment of the body and the generation of offspring—man is not bound to obey man but God alone, for all men are by nature equal." On which Cajetan comments thus: "When you hear that men are equal according to nature, understand this not of the equality of dignity or nobility, for one is found naturally superior to another in mind and body, but rather of the equality of power, for no man has any power over another in those things which relate to nature." We have here a clear doctrine of equal natural rights, which, while it is fruitful in social and political applications, is not based on any impossible or utopian hypotheses. Every man has the same inalienable imprescriptible right to spiritual freedom and to the exterior conditions of a human existence, whether

[1] Omnes homines sunt natura pares.—2.2, q. 104, a. 5. Quantum ad naturalia omnes sunt pares.—4 *Sent.*, d. 36, q. 1, a. 2, ad. 1. The actual expression "omnes nascuntur liberi" does not seem to be used by S. Thomas, but it is very frequently used by Thomists, *e.g.*, Soto, *De institia et iure*, v. 2, 2. (Med. 1580, p. 280*b*.)

[2] 2.2, q. 104, a. 5; Cajetan in Leonine ed. ix. 391*a*.

proprietary, personal or marital. Within this sacred sphere no human organization can intrude. Hence S. Thomas strictly limits even serfdom. "A serf," he says,[1] "is his master's property in matters superadded to the natural, but in matters of nature all are equal."

It follows from this that there is no such thing as natural superiority in the strict sense.[2] The Aristotelian conception of a natural slave (φύσει δοῦλος) is as incompatible with Christianity as the Nietzschian ideal of a superman. No doubt, much of Aristotle's phraseology was accepted,[3] but this was at the price of christianizing his ideas. Thus the principle of natural inferiority and servitude was reduced to this axiom of competence: "Those who are pre-eminent in intellect naturally dominate, while those who are intellectually deficient but corporally strong seem by nature to be adapted for serving, as Aristotle says in his *Politics*.[4]" This idea

[1] 2 *Sent.*, d. 36, q. 1, a. 2, ad. 1.

[2] Homines non sunt sibi invicem praeeminentes secundum ordinem naturae.—2 *Sent.*, d. 6, q. 1, a. 4, ad. 5. Dr. Carlyle (*op. cit.* p. 133) remarks on this: "The passage occurs in his earliest work, a commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, and it is possible that he had not at that time so strong a conviction of the necessity of human government in this world, whether before or after the Fall, as later. It is perhaps more probable that S. Thomas merely means that men are not, like angels and devils, divided into orders rising one above the other." This is precisely what is meant; the rest of the sentence runs, "Even the damned are not ordered for the exercise of others or for punishment." As he says elsewhere (2 *Sent.*, d. 44, q. 1, a. 3): Creatura rationalis, quantum est de se, non ordinatur ut ad finem ad aliam, ut homo ad hominem. There is no contradiction whatever in S. Thomas, for he says in his last work (*Summa*, p. 1, q. 109, a. 2, ad. 3): Daemones non sunt aequales secundum naturam, unde in eis est naturalis praelatio. Quod in hominbus non contingit qui natura sunt pares.

[3] For S. Thomas, the pioneer defender of Aristotle, this acceptance was absolutely necessary—to have admitted anti-Christian elements in Aristotelianism would have been fatal—in order to defend Peripatetic study against the numerous attacks of the ultra-orthodox conservatives. Sometimes the defence of the Stagirite becomes very subtle casuistry. *Cf. Pol.* vii. 12; Fretté 26, 484: Aristotles non dicit secundum intentionem suam quod debeant exterminari aliqui nati, sed secundum legem gentium.

[4] *Contra gentes* iii. 81. In the actual commentaries the language is much more Aristotelian: a natural slave is one who lacks βουλευτικόν. Ille est naturaliter servus qui habet aptitudinem naturalem ut sit alterius, inquantum scilicet non potest regi propria ratione per quam homo est dominus sui, sed solum ratione alterius; propter quod naturaliter alterius est *quasi* servus.—*Pol.* i. 3. I have

was also applied to politics. "In human government," continues S. Thomas, "inordination arises from the fact that someone rules not on account of intellectual preeminence, but usurps power for himself by brute force, or someone is appointed to government owing to sensual affection." That is, S. Thomas quietly substitutes the undeniable fact of accidental disparity for Aristotle's theory of natural superiority. "Wherever," says the philosopher,[1] "there happens to be a whole family or an individual superior in virtue to all the others, . . . it is but just that this family should have the regal and supreme power or that this individual should be king." A condition of affairs which, as even Aristotle had to admit, is "hard to realize;"[2] for no man or set of men has a monopoly of ἀρετή and δύναμις πολιτική in a community of human beings. It is certainly a curious irony of history that a theory of quasi-natural designation, which is practically equivalent to this discredited Aristotelianism, should be found in many, if not most, contemporary expositions of Scholasticism.[3]

It is important to understand S. Thomas's position in this matter, for he was one of the first to modify the earlier and more unqualified medieval view of equality,[4]

noticed that when the Philosopher's language is particularly difficult to swallow, S. Thomas dexterously inserts a "quasi." Compare *Pol.* iii. 16; Fretté 26, 274: Hoc enim est secundum naturam quod ille qui excedit secundum virtutem sit dominus aliorum. . . Quare relinquitur istum debere principiari omnibus et semper et dominum esse, et omnes illi tali obedire *quasi* ex inclinatione naturali.

[1] *Politica* iii. 17, 1288 a. 15.

[2] Ibid vii. 14, 1332 *b*. 23: οὐ ῥᾴδιον. *Cf.* S. Thomas (*Pol.* vii. 10; Fretté 26, 468*b*.): Si inveniatur aliquis unus in civitate vel regno qui omnibus istis superexcellat alios, iustum est ipsum principari *solum quamdiu est talis.*

[3] For example, Cathrein, *Philosophia moralis*, 1915[9], thesis 81, §587, p. 398: Determinatio originaria subiecti potestatis civilis fieri potest variis causis, quae alicui personae in concretis circumstantiis tantam moralem praeponderantiam et auctoritatem conferant, *ut ipsa sola ad regendam societatem idonea sit.* So also Schiffini, *Disputationes phil. moralis*, 1891, ii. 412: Ex ipsa itaque exigentia ordinis naturalis constituitur [talis persona] totius reipublicae caput.

[4] Thus Ratherius, bishop of Verona (†948), *Praeloquia* i. 22; Migne P.L. 136, 165: Intellegas homines non hominibus sed volatilibus, bestiis et piscibus esse praelatos, omnesque a Deo natura aequales conditos, sed inaequalitate morum faciente aliis alios in tantum suppositos ut plerumque alii dominentur etiam meliori-

by clearly emphasising two other ideas : natural sociability and accidental inequalities.

One person rules another as a free man [he says[1]] when he directs him either to the good of him who is being directed or to the common good. And even in the state of innocence there would have been such a rule of man over man, for two reasons :

(1) Because man is naturally a social being. . . .

(2) Because if one man had over others supereminence in knowledge and justice, it would have been undesirable that this should not result in advantage to others.

Thus while it is true that men have equal natural rights, still some hierarchical gradation is essential for their social coexistence. And this gradation should be based on the existing distribution of disparities and aptitudes. "Those men who excel in active faculties ought to be directed by those who excel in mental faculties," says S. Thomas. And again, "It is impossible that the common good of the State should progress, unless there is virtue in the citizens, at least in those to whom the government is entrusted."[2] It is thus definitely laid down that men, though equal in all essential rights

---

bus. The great exponent of this view was Gregory the Great (and also, of course, Gregory VII.). "Ubi non deliquimus omnes pares sumus," he says in his *Liber pastoralis curae* ii. 6. Which S. Thomas seeks to interpret : Gregorius per verba illa intendit excludere disparitatem quae est secundum differentiam iustitiae et peccati.—*Summa*, p. 1, q. 96, a. 3, ad. 1.

[1] 1, q. 96, a. 4. The innovation in this view will be realized by contrasting it with that of the *De eruditione principum* (i. 1 ; Fretté, 27, 552*a*), usually included among the works of Aquinas but certainly not his, probably by William Perrault O.P. (*fl.* 1250) : Potestas terrena qua homo super alios homines est, non est res naturae sed sequela culpae. . . Non enim datum est homini ab initio ut praeesset hominibus, sed ut praeesset creaturis irrationabilibus. . . Naturaliter aequitas est inter homines, non praelatio. (*Cf.* S. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* xix. 15.). This writer is very thoroughgoing in his levelling principles (*ibid.* i. 4, p. 558) : Omnes ergo vel sumus nobiles vel sumus ignobiles. Non legitur Deus fecisse unum hominem argenteum unde essent nobiles et unum luteum unde essent ignobiles ; sed unumquemque de limo terrae plasmavit. . . Nemo nobilior nisi cui rectius est ingenium et bonis artibus aptius.

[2] *Contra gentes* iii. 78, 3 ; *Summa* 1.2, q. 92, a. 1, ad. 3. *Cf. Pol.* iii. 8 : Melius est principiari quod melius est et studiosius. *Prolog. in Metaph.* : Homines intellectu vigentes sunt naturaliter aliorum rectores et domini.

and fundamental claims, are unequal psychologically and politically. Democracy, in fact, if it is not to result in a chaos of mediocrity and incompetence, must be based on aristocracy in the strict and literal sense of the term—the rule of the best.

That is why there is always an aristocratic flavour about these Schoolmen. They have a dislike of a certain conception of democracy which happens to be very ancient and very modern. It was Aristotle[1] who said that the democratic ideal was to count heads without weighing them—κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀλλα μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν. So completely was this view accepted that the designation of magistrates was regarded as democratic only when it was done *by lot*.[2] Any form of election was regarded as an aristocratic institution, in the sense that its object is to sift out merit. We in these latter days, who have almost lost opinion-forming forces independent of the political machine or of financial interests, cannot so regard the process of election. But it is the merit of S. Thomas that he boldly asserted those two principles—popular control and competent management—whose reconciliation, in economic as in political life, is the deepest problem confronting democracy. He had, doubtless, a very high ideal of the qualifications requisite not only for govern-

---

[1] *Politica* vi. 2, 1317*b* 3.

[2] So the Persian Otanes in Herodotus iii. 82. Aristotle (*ibid.* 1317*b*. 20) makes a significant limitation : " the use of the lot in appointing to offices of State, either all or such as do not require experience or special skill." This idea long survived. Thus Alphonsus Tostat (†1452), *Commentaria in primam partem Exodi*, c. 18, q. 9 (Venice 1615, pp. 268*f*) : Principatus democraticus est qui per sortes est. . . . Principatus aristocraticus proprie est eligibilis, nam principatus iste est in solis virtuosis, electio autem est de bono et de magis ; ideo qui virtuosi et boni sunt in principes assumentur data electione eorum. It is this Aristotelian idea that a pure democracy excludes consideration of merit (ἀρετή)—an idea not altogether dissonant with present-day realities—which long made the *term* ' democracy ' so unacceptable. *Cf.* S. Thomas *De reg. princ.* i. 1 ; Fretté 27, 338*a* : Si vero iniquum regimen per multos, democratia vocatur. Even Molina, writing in 1596, finds it necessary to apologise for using the word—*De iustitia* ii. 23 (1602, p. 119). An inverse change has befallen the word ' aristocracy.'

ment but for citizenship.[1] But he also realized the necessity and justice of self-government. "All should have some part in the government," he says,[2] "for thus the peace of the people is preserved and all love and observe such a régime." "When the people see that the commonweal is not in the power of one person, they do not regard the common good as a thing belonging to someone else, but each one looks upon it as if it were his own. Hence experience shows us that a single city-state administered by annual rulers can sometimes do more than a king even if he had three or four such states; and small services exacted by kings are borne with more difficulty than great burdens imposed by the community of citizens." Wherein there speaks a shrewd psychologist and a true democrat.

ALFRED O'RAHILLY.

---

[1] Propter magnam potestatem quae regi conceditur, de facili regnum degenerat in tyrannidem nisi sit perfecta virtus eius cui talis potestas conceditur. . . . Perfecta autem virtus in paucis invenitur.—1.2, q. 105, a. 1, ad. 2. Simpliciter quidem civis est qui potest agere ea quae sunt civium, puta dare consilium vel iudicium in populo.—*ibid.* a. 3, ad. 2. Compare the complaint against contemporary Italian politicians made in *De reg. princ.* ii. 10 (Fretté 27, 365*a*): Agunt sicut mercede conducti, non ad utilitatem subditorum sed ad lucrum suum.

[2] 1.2, q. 105, a. 1; *De reg. princ.* i. 4, Fretté 27, 341. Compare *ibid.* iv. 7, p. 396*a*: Dare ergo principatum uni soli est causa seditionis in multitudine. . . . Laudabilis igitur politia est in qua secundum merita unicuique civi vicissim distribuuntur honores.

THE ECONOMICS OF NATIONALISATION.

BY HENRY SOMERVILLE, M.A.

IN the September issue of STUDIES the ethics of nationalisation was discussed by a distinguished theologian whose conclusion was that from the standpoint of morals the nationalisation of any or of all the means of production is lawful if such nationalisation is to the advantage of the State or the common welfare. To discuss adequately the economics of nationalisation is to discuss all the practical advantages and disadvantages of nationalisation, to discuss whether nationalisation is conducive or otherwise to the common good. I say this because it is often erroneously supposed that "Economics" means something narrow and technical. In any except an abstract and fragmentary treatment of the question it is impossible to consider the "economics" of any great matter like nationalisation apart from its "politics" and other aspects. The effects that nationalisation might have, for instance, in regard to good government are at least as important as its effects upon the production of material wealth. The economist who regards his subject not so much as the science of marketable commodities as of social welfare interprets the "economics" of a question in a very wide sense. Nevertheless, exigencies of space will force me in this article to confine myself largely to what C. S. Devas would call the "pecuniary" aspects of nationalisation.[1]

There is question of nationalised industry. Industry is for the production of wealth and production is for

[1] Devas, *Political Economy*, Prologue, s. 2.

consumption. To have consumption as it ought to be there must be not only adequate production but satisfactory distribution. We may test an industrial system by its results in production and in distribution. Would nationalisation as compared with private ownership, State industry as compared with private industry, result in better production or better distribution ?

Generally speaking, private ownership and private industry hold the field at the present time. The existing regime is challenged by the advocates of nationalisation, or to use a wider term, of Socialism. What are the grounds on which the existing system is challenged ? It can be challenged on the ground of inefficient production or of inequitable distribution. Everyone knows that the main attacks, or at least the most popular attacks against the existing system have been directed against its distributive side. The success of private industry in causing an unprecedented increase in man's productive powers and in filling the world with wealth hitherto undreamed of is admitted by critics who are most severe in their condemnation of the inequality with which the good things produced are shared out among those who take part in the productive process. Private industry makes the few very rich and the many very poor. Such is the commonest and most popular indictment. It is not, however, the whole case brought against the existing system. Many critics, especially those Socialists who are not themselves of the poorer classes, attack private industry as wasteful and relatively unproductive, and they claim that a system of collective ownership would be vastly more efficient from the point of view of production as well as more equitable in its distributive action. To arrive at a conclusion, therefore, on the economics of nationalisation, we must consider the claims made for its superior productive efficiency and its more equitable distribution, assuming that by more equitable is meant more equal distribution.

Let us take first the more popular question of distribution. The argument is that under a system of private ownership the capitalist is enabled to get too much and the labourer is forced to take too little. The worker is exploited. Rent, interest and profits swallow up what ought to be wages. The poor are poor because the rich are rich. The labourer gets so little because the capitalist gets so much. The system of private industry and private ownership results in ill-distribution. Such is the contention of those who advance the rival system of public ownership.

If we are to be scientific we must make sure of all our facts. Can we make sure that there *is* ill-distribution? The answer seems obvious. And can we make sure that the poverty existing is due to ill-distribution? The answer is less obvious. Contrasts between the extreme wealth of a very few and the extreme poverty of the many are striking, but often not helpful. A capitalist employs a thousand men who each get £2 a week wages. The capitalist makes a profit of £200 a week, or £10,400 a year, a hundred times the income of the average employé. The disparity is impressive, but if the whole of the profit were put on to wages each worker would get as his share of the increase only 4s. a week.

Professor Bowley,[1] whose authority is unequalled, has analysed the national income as it was divided in the census year, 1911, which for our purpose is a better year to take, as being more normal, than any war year. The total population of the United Kingdom was 45,220,000. The total income of all the people of the Kingdom in that year, not counting revenue derived from investments abroad, amounted to £1,896 millions. This was the whole product of industry in the United Kingdom that year. The amount paid in manual workers' wages £782 millions. Salaries, profits, interest

[1] Bowley, *The Division of the Product of Industry*, Clarendon Press, 1919.

and rent going to people enjoying more than £160 a year aggregated £742 millions. The rest of the national income goes to salaried persons, small employers, farmers, etc. (not including wage-earners) whose income is less than £160. In order to determine how the " socialisation " of the larger incomes would affect the shares of the lower-paid classes Prof. Bowley supposes that all " unearned " incomes (except those going to people with less than £160) are abolished ; further, that all salaries are reduced to £160 a year, though none are raised to that level. The socialisation of the higher incomes on this supposition would give the State, according to Professor Bowley, about £550 millions gross. But this confiscation is not net gain to the State for from it must be subtracted what the well-to-do classes already contribute in direct taxation and what is re-invested annually as new capital. Prof. Bowley reckons that when these subtractions are made the maximum available to the State is £250 millions, less than a third of the annual wages bill and less than a seventh of the total annual income produced in the United Kingdom.

The distributable income is also shown by Prof. Bowley in another and a simpler way. The total income of the United Kingdom (always excluding the £194 millions received from investments abroad) is £1,900 millions. Subtract £230 millions for re-investment, subtract £180 millions as Central Government expenses and £40 millions for local rates and there is a remainder of £1,450 millions divisible between 45 millions of people. The average annual income per family of five, rate and tax free, is then £160. It is a moderate sum and shows that absolutely equal division of the national income would allow no family to be much above a standard of frugal comfort. Prof. Bowley's conclusion is worth quoting :—

Those who have only looked at the considerable aggregate of national income and the proportion that is attributable to wages,

and then considered the large amount that was received by a limited number of rich people (*e.g.*, that 12,400 persons in 1911-12 had incomes over £5,000, aggregating £152,000,000), have been led to the view that the obvious inequality of the distribution could be rectified by drawing on a considerable fund that was in the hands of a small number of rich people, who spent it luxuriously and wastefully, and diverting it to wage-earners whose incomes it is supposed would be increased by the transfer to a level of relative affluence. They appear to have exaggerated the amount not already in the hands of persons with incomes less than £160 and not to have considered that a great part of the expenses of government and the savings necessary for the progress of an increasing population, are drawn from the larger incomes.[1]

It is essential to remember that all the figures given in our discussion apply to the year 1911, before the war inflations began. The £160 a year then available for each family meant much more than £160 means to-day, and if equal distribution could have been brought about equitably and economically it would have been well worth doing. But absolute equality is proposed by few people, even among Socialists, and if any inequality is allowed the raising of some families above the £160 level means the depression of other families below. The average itself being so low, two important conclusions are to be drawn, first that re-distribution that is to benefit substantially the millions of poor must be very drastic, and the middle classes as well as the very rich must endure great reductions of income ; second, that we cannot afford any diminution of production. The argument for nationalisation based upon the existing inequalities of distribution is not invalidated by our findings so far, but it is rather closely limited.

The limitations of any claim for nationalisation based on the plea of improved distribution are clearly perceived by educated Socialists, and *their* criticisms of Capitalism are directed more against its weaknesses as a productive system than against its failures to secure a satisfactory

[1] Op. cit. p. 19.

distribution of the product. Here the apologists of Capitalism had thought themselves on their strongest ground. They believed that private business enterprise, inspired by the motive of profit making, and spurred by competition, was indisputably more efficient than any State or other public enterprise could be. This capitalist claim, being now challenged, must be examined. The question is whether private enterprise is superior in productive efficiency to public enterprise; and in fairness to public enterprise we must take account of municipalisation as well as of nationalisation. No one has yet suggested the nationalisation of tramways or the municipalisation of railways. The unit of socialisation depends on the character of the industry.

If we were discussing the old-fashioned Socialist contention that all capitalistic profit represented robbery of the workers then we might discuss the question of nationalisation generally without reference to the conditions of particular industries. But we are leaving that contention aside and dealing only with the respective merits of public and private enterprise from the point of view of productive efficiency. From this point of view it is plain that we cannot argue from the particular to the general. The nationalisation of railways does not justify the nationalisation of farms; the failure of Government operation of the telephone service does not discredit Government carrying of letters. Some industries may be suited to public management and others better left to private enterprise. These propositions will not be disputed, and the reasons for them will appear in the course of our discussion. Another obvious point is that one government would succeed where a different government would fail in an industrial enterprise. The Prussian State Government has done excellently with its railways, because it has a service of very efficiently trained officials. The Mexican Government, for instance, would not be expected to achieve a similar success. A further point,

often overlooked, is that when a government has gone so far along the path of nationalisation it cannot advantageously go further, not because of any peculiarities in the remaining un-nationalised industries, but because the government has already sufficiently weighted itself with as much work as it can attend to.

The general advantages claimed for nationalisation are the advantages which belong to all large-scale production, plus the further advantage of industrial activities being directed by the aim of public service instead of private profit. Nationalisation will secure "unification." This is the word constantly used in all the discussions in England on the future of the mining industry. The advantages of unification are so generally recognised (except by small minorities, including some Guild Socialists) that the opponents of nationalisation are constrained to propose schemes of unification along with a system of private ownership—schemes which are denounced as "trustification" by nationalisers. To Fabians like Mr. Sidney Webb and Sir Leo Chiozza Money the shocking thing in England is not that colliery proprietors are so few but that they are so many: there are not less than 1,500 of them. With such a multitude of independent concerns how is it possible to have proper co-ordination! So far as the advantages of nationalisation are the advantages of large-scale production I need not set them forth in detail, as to do so would take much space, and they are to be found in all the economic text-books. The issue between nationalisation and private ownership is also largely the issue between monopoly and competition. Here again I will spare readers the tedium of enumerating the pros and cons of the text books. But it is important to note that private ownership may result not in competition but in monopoly, with all its merits and demerits. In some industries there cannot be competition and monopoly is inevitable. We could not, for instance, have two tramway companies laying competing lines in

the same street. It would be absurd to have several overlapping and competing telegraph systems in one area. When we must have monopoly it is a question whether we should prefer a public or a private monopoly. For the private monopoly there is this to be said: that it can be regulated by the State, but when the State is itself the monopolist regulation is not so easy.

The mines and the railways of England are the most favourable subjects for nationalisation because they would be improved so much by unification. Railway managers in the days before the war were wont to deplore the fact that they had to compete with each other to the mutual loss of dividends, and when the Government took over the railways at the beginning of the war the control was left in the hands of those same managers, but they acted as a single committee operating all the lines in the country as one system. Still further unification has been sought since the Armistice by the erection of an Autocrat of Transport in the person of Sir Eric Geddes. With unification there need be no duplication of lines, no running of competitive and unnecessary trains, no needlessly roundabout routes to keep traffic on the lines of one company, no shortage of wagons and other rolling stock on one line while a neighbouring line has an idle surplus. With regard to mining it is a common subject of complaint that as a result of divided ownership great walls of coal between different pits have to be left unworked because the respective owners cannot agree as to lines of demarcation. In various ways the existence of separate ownership leads to duplication of machinery and of labour with consequent increase of expense which could be avoided by unification.

Nationalisation, it is urged, would contribute in other ways to efficiency and economy in operating the mines. At the present time there are widely differing standards of efficiency in the managements of the different pits. Under nationalisation there could be a levelling up of all

to the standard of the highest, for the ablest men in the industry might apply themselves to the improvement of the whole field instead of having their activities confined to the properties of the particular private companies by whom they are employed. Experiments could be carried out on a larger scale and the whole industry reap the benefit of improvements. Mines have not been fully developed under the present system because of lack of capital. It is contended that the State can obtain capital more easily and more cheaply than private enterprises can. However, the common view of the superiority of State credit is partly fallacious. A Government can borrow more cheaply only because it can give greater security, and it can give a greater security because if it fails to make profit out of its industrial enterprises it draws on the taxpayer for the deficit. There is no real economy to the nation. The taxpayer, instead of the investor, has to bear the losses.

The arguments for nationalisation which we have mentioned are applicable in a greater or less degree to other schemes of unification. But there is one advantage claimed by Socialists which, if the claim is valid at all, is special to nationalisation, and it is that the superior motive of public service is substituted for the inferior motive of private gain. Socialists contend that the motive of the public service is not only higher morally but more conducive to economic efficiency. It is necessary to distinguish different senses in which this contention may be true. As an illustration let us suppose that the cinema film industry is in the hands of a private company working for profit. Every effort that enterprise and ingenuity can suggest is made to produce films that will appeal to the popular tastes. The plots, the staging, and the photography are made to be the finest attainable from the point of view of appealing to the taste of the audiences. But as the aim is to make money, films are produced which though "popular"

are vicious. Private enterprise is efficient not for good but for evil. A Government film-producing establishment, we may suppose, being free from the temptation of money-making, would not produce debasing works. The nationalisation of the liquor traffic has long been advocated on the ground that the Government, not being actuated by the motive of making the maximum profit, would not be guilty of the abuses that follow from the trade being in private hands. We all know that there are many things on the market which somebody profits by making and selling, but which nobody gains in any true sense by buying. They are things that men would be better without, but because men are willing to pay for them profit seekers are active to supply them. If production was carried on for the public good, as it presumably would be under nationalisation, these undesirable things would not be put on the market. In this sense, it is claimed, the motive of public service is superior economically to the motive of private gain.

In another way Socialists say the man who feels he is a servant of the State will work better than the man who is working only for himself. A higher motive is a stronger motive! Although we would wish this view to be true there is little evidence in favour of it. In still another sense public service is more plausibly claimed to be superior in motive power to private gain. The mass of workers in any industry, it is urged, would work better if they felt that they were working for the whole community rather than for capitalists. This may be true, and it is a legitimate point for nationalisers, but it is not really an example of men working better for the State than for their own interests, but of preferring State interests to the interests of other individuals.

Professor Pigou, a Cambridge economist, has well said that under full nationalisation, at least in large industries like mining and railways, there are *possibilities* of better results than any other plan can offer. All the

economies of the greatest possible unification and the most perfect division of labour can be obtained, all the advantages of giving the ablest men the most appropriate tasks and the widest field for the exercise of their powers, all the advantages of applying to every pit (in the case of mining) the best and latest machinery and methods, the most scientific use of capital. But to *realise* these possibilities there must be a perfectly wise autocrat to manage the industry, for in so far as the management is not wise it may use its tremendous powers injuriously and in so far as it is not autocratic its potentialities may be checked and limited by the less wise. Another pertinent truth pointed out by Professor Pigou is that the defects of an existing method of conducting an industry are demonstrable, but the defects of a proposed scheme are not. We cannot really prove beforehand how nationalisation would work. Proof can only come by experience. We shall presently consider what evidence of experience there is actually available, but first we must proceed a little further with our general consideration of the question.

If the greatest economic arguments for nationalisation consist in the possibilities of unification the chief economic objection to the system is that unification involves centralisation of an extreme kind and therefore the loss of industrial autonomy to individuals and small groups, and with the loss of autonomy there is the loss of initiative. The powers of initiative are generally and rightly regarded as of supreme importance in the men who are carrying on any industrial system. In a Government service the tendency is for system and routine to take the place of initiative. Men may work quite as conscientiously in a public service as for a private employer, but the very organisation of a public service, as we know it in fact, rules out the conditions that promote the cultivation of initiative. When a man is not independent and self-responsible in anything, but only one in a hierarchy of

officials, bound to follow precedent and rules and regulations in every detail, to decide nothing himself but to refer all questions to somebody higher up in his department, and the man higher up himself equally subject to a vast system of minute regulation, it is practically inevitable that all methods should tend to become stereotyped and that routine defies progress. In the Civil Service, as it is, promotion follows seniority and salaries are according to scale, increments coming with length of service, not being varied and adjusted according to differences of desert or capacity. Sir Richard Redmayne, Chief Inspector of Mines, told the Coal Commission that he spoke as a Civil Servant in declaring that the Civil Service, as it now is, could not possibly administer the mining industry. Lord Askwith, also a Civil Servant and formerly Chief Industrial Commissioner, claims that the Civil Service is efficient enough to administer anything, but says that the Civil Service system would have to be recast to make it adaptable to industrial administration. Lord Gainford, a captain of capitalistic industry, who has been Postmaster-General, told the Coal Commission that it was impossible in a Government scheme to offer the kind of salary which would attract the best talent in the country. He said that if he had had no limitations placed upon him as to salaries he could have got a more efficient system in the Post Office. The staff of the Post Office did their work as honestly as capitalistic workers would have done, but they could not depart from the regulations of a State service.

Lord Haldane was another important witness before the Coal Commission, and he said that the Civil Service system as it actually is was a kind which discouraged initiative. The business man, on the other hand, lived in an atmosphere of initiative. After making these admissions Lord Haldane went on to argue that the Civil Service yet did its own work admirably. It did what it was trained to do. Lord Haldane also developed

the very important and interesting thesis that, though the Civil Service as it is was not suited to administer industry, it could be trained to do so. The qualities of industrial leadership could be "educed." Speaking as an ex-Secretary for War Lord Haldane referred to the fact that officers for Army Administration have a special training in administration, and that it is no longer assumed that a man who shows proficiency in strategy and tactics will be a good administrator.

We may now sum up the results of our *â priori* consideration of the economics of nationalisation :

1. Nationalisation cannot justify itself simply by assuring a more equal distribution of the products of industry. It must also prove itself of not inferior productive efficiency.

2. The *â priori* arguments for the advantages of public ownership do not apply equally to all industries. They apply most strongly to industries like railways, telegraphs, electricity, gas and waterworks that are naturally monopolistic and that best lend themselves to unified control and large-scale organisation.

3. Apart from the special unsuitability of some industries to State control there is a presumption against the State being able to attend properly to more than a certain amount of industrial business. Thus there are two reasons why it is fallacious to argue from the particular to the general, and to say that because the State can advantageously take over some industries it may take over all.

4. The motive of private profit-making leads to the production of much trash and "illth," and this must be counted as inefficiency. We may reasonably expect less of this evil under State management. Apart from this it is doubtful whether men would work better as public servants than in private industry, whether as employers or as employed.

5. The conditions of the Civil Service to-day make it unfitted for industrial administration. It is arguable that a different system of training and organisation in the Civil Service could obviate this unfitness. But the nature of State organisation predisposes it to the evils of routine, inertia, stagnation, with a loss of the qualities of initiative, originality, progressiveness.

No discussion of nationalisation would be satisfactory without an enquiry into the actual working of publicly managed industries. There is an immense number of great public industrial undertakings in Europe and North America, and perhaps most strikingly of all in Australasia. Though there is no lack of material for enquiry it is not easy to find any indisputable tests of the efficiency of nationalised undertakings. It seldom happens that public and private undertakings of a similar kind are working side by side and are subjected to the test of direct competition. Profit-making is one test, but it is unfair to condemn a public undertaking for not showing a financial surplus, or even for not being self-supporting, if it is deliberately conducted on a non-commercial basis for the public benefit. The Belgian State Railways, even if they had to be subsidised from the taxes, could well claim to justify themselves by the stimulus and assistance they have given to Belgian industry. On the other hand, a State undertaking showing a profit might be doing so as a result of extorting monopoly prices from the public and be used, as the State tobacco monopoly in France, simply as a means of raising revenue.

We all of us have some direct personal means of judging the working of nationalisation as well as of private enterprise. We use, for instance, the Government post office, telegraphs, and telephones. The Government management of telephones in this country has become a by-word for inefficiency. However, there has been an admitted decline in efficiency in the company-owned telephone systems of Canada. "Central" pleaded a

man on the telephone in Toronto last summer, after he had got three wrong numbers in succession, "Central, would you please tell me what number I should ask for in order to get Gerrard 3781?" The excuse offered by the private company for poor service in Canada is the same as that made by the Postmaster-General here—shortage of equipment due to war conditions. The Government's telegraph service can be regarded as only fairly good and the charges are high. Now that we pay three halfpence for a letter and a penny for a postcard the letter service cannot be considered cheap, and the public going into a post office have usually to wait an unreasonably long time before getting attended to. From the point of view of the public the Post Office must be regarded as only a moderately successful institution. From the point of view of the worker the Post Office is not superior to the average private business in its conditions of employment and salaries and wages. Up to the outbreak of the war many postmen in England were paid sweated wages.

The Post Office comes out not very favourably when judged from the taxpayers' point of view. In 1916 the Committee on Public Retrenchment, of which Sir Leo Chiozza Money and Mr. J. H. Thomas were members, reported unanimously with regard to the Post Office: "We have, however, been impressed by the fact that of all the numerous services managed by the Post Office, hardly one shows any profit except the letter post." (Cd. 8200, p. 20). The same report states with regard to the telegraphs:

> The history of the telegraphs is most unsatisfactory. They were taken over in 1870 at a cost (including capital expenditure on extensions) of £10,129,687, in the anticipation that they would yield a profit to the State. After the second year of Post Office management the profit failed to cover interest on the capital outlay. Year by year the financial position has grown worse. In recent years the loss upon working has been not less than £1,000,000 a year, and this loss includes nothing for interest due to the State

upon the aggregate losses of previous years. In the year 1911-12 the Post Office calculated the accumulated loss at £21,796,520, or double the amount of the original purchase money.[1]

The telephones have made a profit for the State, but barely as much as the State formerly received as royalties from the National Telephone Company, and there is a considerable loss to the State if one reckons the income taxes formerly paid by the shareholders. The position of the Post Office is now financially less favourable than before, owing chiefly to wage increases. The letter carrying profits do not now, according to the estimates for 1919-20, make up for the losses in other Post Office departments, and the estimated deficit in the Post Office as a whole is £274,000.[2]

In judging the Post Office it must be remembered that deterioration in service and increase of charges has been our experience in all industries during and since the war, and there might have been much more serious grounds for complaint if the Post Office had been in private hands. Whether rightly or not, the Post Office is generally regarded as one of the most successful examples of State management in the world. Another famous and very successful example of nationalisation is the Prussian State Railways. Their financial success is phenomenal. Since 1872 a total of nearly three billion marks has been placed at the disposal of the Prussian Government for other State purposes out of the surplus of the railways.[3] There was for the fifteen years ending 1910 an average net profit of 1·82 per centum of the capital cost after allowing all deductions claimed by the sternest critic[4] on account of interest, sinking fund, and other fixed charges. Merely from a profit making point

[1] Quoted in "The Coal Industry: Dangers to Nationalisation," by Harold Cox (Longmans, 1919).

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

[3] Emil Davies, *The Case for Railway Nationalisation*, p. 126, Collins.

[4] Pratt, *The Case Against Railway Nationalisation*, p. 47, Collins.

of view this compares extremely favourably with British railways. Moreover, the passenger rates and freight charges on the Prussian lines have been far lower than those of this country. The worst feature of the Prussian system is the treatment of the railway workers. A writer in *The Railway Review*, the organ of the British railwaymen's trade union, says in the course of an article published Oct. 4, 1912 :—

> No journalist who treats of the Prussian railway system would be doing his duty if he failed to emphasise the anti-democratic attitude of the Government towards its railway employés, which constitutes the one great and glaring evil. The Government's feudal conceptions may be realised from the fact that it regards its employés as bound to it body and soul, politically as well as industrially ; and the open voting system, which still prevails in Prussian State elections as it did in England half a century ago, places a terrible power for penalisation in the hands of the State authorities should the State employés choose to vote for candidates of whom the Government does not approve. In fact for State employés to exercise the elementary right of citizenship by voting for the candidate and the policy most in accord with their own views is to run the risk of forfeiting their posts and jeopardising their livelihood.[1]

The foregoing quotation is given not to introduce any discussion of the political problems of nationalisation, which are outside the limits set for this article, but to indicate that the efficiency of the Prussian lines may be due to the hard discipline enforced. As regards rates of wages and hours of labour it does not appear that Prussian workers were more unfavourably treated than British railway employés before the war. No other State railway system in the world equals the success of Prussia from a financial standpoint. But almost every other country in the world, except the United Kingdom and the United States, have their railway systems more or less nationalised. In Canada there are both private

[1] Quoted *ibid.*, p. 128.

railways and Government railways. In some countries, as in India, the railways are owned by the Government, but leased to private companies for operation. This is also done in the case of the Belgian light railways. It would not be helpful to enumerate at length the merits and demerits of the various systems in different countries. Both public and private enterprises have their successes and their failures, and no academic student can strike the balance between them, especially as "political" as well as "economic" considerations must be weighed in considering whether particular Governments should take over the railways in their territories. But there is this to be said from an economic point of view: that countries with the most diverse political constitutions, like Prussia, Japan, and Australia, have found it preferable or necessary as well as feasible to have nationalised railways. Just as practically every country nationalises the business of carrying letters so the majority of countries nationalise their railways, and there are at present strong movements in favour of railway nationalisation in England, in Canada, and to a less degree in the United States. About half the total railway mileage of the world is owned and worked entirely by Government enterprise.[1]

Though transport and communications, and the supply of common utilities of uniform quality like water, gas and electricity, are the most favoured fields for State and municipal enterprises there is scarcely a single industry that is not in public hands in some country or other. The most interesting and novel experiments have been made in Australasia. Queensland is largely advertised as a country of successful nationalisation. The Premier and Attorney-General of that State, Mr. T. J. Ryan, gave evidence before the Coal Commission on May 6 last. He said that the Government of which he is the head was returned to power in May, 1915. The

[1] *State and Municipal Enterprise* (*New Statesman Supplement*, 1915).

State had previously had control of the principal railways. Now the State had engaged in insurance, mineral oil production, fish shops, meat shops, pastoral stations, saw-mills, coal mines, iron and steel works, canneries, butteries, and hotels. These enterprises, said Mr. Ryan, were successful. The aggregate net profit for State enterprises in 1918 was £123,007. There were some failures which he attributed to transient causes. The State mines, he mentioned, were taken over only for Government and railway coal. It is too soon to speak with any confidence as to the real benefits of the State policy in Queensland. In the process of nationalisation private interests were very roughly treated, though it appears that those same interests had been guilty of wicked profiteering in the first nine months of the war. The Queensland Government have issued a Red Book, entitled "Socialism at Work," in which their achievements, especially in bringing down prices, are chronicled.

New Zealand, for a much longer period than Queensland, has had the reputation of being "socialised" to a very high degree. One of the witnesses before the Coal Commission (on May 30 last) was Mr. F. M. B. Fisher, a member of the New Zealand Government from 1912 to 1915. He said that the Government had nationalised a great many industries in New Zealand. There were, he said, more strikes under the Government than under private ownership. During the national strike in 1913 the national coalminers and the sailors on Government steamers joined the strike. In 1890 the workers on the New Zealand railways, though completely nationalised, struck in a body. Departmental regulations, said Mr. Fisher, rob a man of practically all power of initiative. The principle of Government departments is that, if you give a man power to make a decision, he may make a mistake. Therefore, in order to avoid mistakes avoid decisions!

Mr. Fisher evidently belongs to a political party that

opposes Government ownership, and Mr. Ryan evidently belongs to an opposite party. Both were called before the Coal Commission by rival sides for frankly partisan purposes, though this is not to cast doubt on the evidence of either witness. All we can conclude is that nationalisation in practice does not make converts of everybody, nor does it fail to keep a strong body of opinion in its favour. If we extended our survey of working examples of nationalisation to all countries and to each enterprise in detail I venture to say that our conclusion would be unaltered. No further examination will be attempted in this article owing to limits of space. Nationalisation has been proved by experience to be practicable economically on a very large scale, but there is no experience to weaken our theoretical presumption[1] that there are limits to the practicable extension of nationalisation. I say nationalisation has been proved economically practicable on a wide scale, which means that it has been tolerable, but I avoid saying "successful." In this I am following the wise caution of the two greatest advocates of nationalisation in the world, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb, who sum up their comprehensive enquiry into State and municipal enterprise by saying :—

> In face of the widespread incursion of State and Municipal governments all over the world into so many different departments of industry—continued for a whole century and steadily increasing in volume with growing experience of the results—it is, we think, only of academic interest to discuss the question of whether or not government enterprise as such can be deemed "successful." No such abstract question can be properly put or answered. Whether any particular step forward shall be taken is, in fact, decided, whether or not we should have it so, not on general principles by the academic economist, or by the partisan of either Individualist or Collectivist theory, but, on the actual experience lying behind each case, by the practical administrator and the citizen elector. And the general trend of these decisions is, as we have seen, unmistakably shown in the great development of State

[1] *Supra*, p. 25.

and Municipal enterprise during the last thirty years, in all the civilised countries of the world, in practically all the departments of life.[1]

In qualification of the last sentence quoted from Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb I would submit that the extension of public industrial enterprise must not be considered by itself. It must be thought of in relation to the general movement of industry and the extension of private industry. If public enterprises have increased enormously so have private enterprises ; and even in the most " advanced " Australasian states the bulk of industrial activities are conducted by private enterprise ; and I think that Mr. and Mrs. Webb would regard those states as still dominantly " capitalist " rather than " collectivist." In England there may be railway nationalisation in the near future, at a time when road transport by privately owned motor vehicles will be rapidly developing. The aeroplane industry is now growing up as a private enterprise though the State is vitally concerned in its success. These compensations, as they may be called, are constantly operating, and they explain why the striking advances in " collectivism " are not necessarily at the expense of private ownership. There is no reason to believe that universal nationalisation or anything approaching it, is ever going to come by itself as the logical outcome of existing tendencies. In the view of the present writer, a survey of nationalisation in present operation in all countries yields substantially the same economic conclusions as those we arrived at from our *â priori* consideration of the question.

HENRY SOMERVILLE.

[1] *State and Municipal Enterprise* (*New Statesman Supplement*, 1915).

CITY MANAGEMENT IN AMERICA.[1]

BY JOHN J. HORGAN.

"New times demand new measures and new men;
The world advances, and in time outgrows
The laws that in our fathers days were best;
And doubtless, after us, some purer scheme
Will be shaped out by wiser men than we,
Made wiser by the steady growth of truth."

LOWELL.

AMONGST the many problems now attracting the attention of a sadly sobered world few are more important than those concerned with the development and improvement of town and city. As the country is the basis of our economic life, the source of our food supply, the city is the nexus of our intellectual life, the centre of industrial development and national thought. Hence its ordered progress is a matter of urgent importance.

In the first place it is necessary to remember that the management of a large city is in reality a business undertaking of tremendous complexity and that democratic institutions do not dispense with the need for efficiency. The management of a city being therefore in its major aspects a business undertaking, it is desirable to consider

---

[1] Arthur B. Gilbert: *American Cities: Their Methods of Business.* (Macmillan. 1918. $1.50).

Chestor E. Rightor: *City Manager in Dayton.* (Macmillan. 1919. $.50).

Edward A. Fitzpatrick: *Experts in City Government.* (Appleton. 1919. 10/6).

William B. Munro: *The Government of the United States.* (Macmillan 1919. $2.75).

William B. Munro: *The Government of American Cities.* (Macmillan. 1913. $2.00).

it in the light of business experience and progress. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century the prevailing business units were the sole proprietorship and partnership forms of organisation. These gave way in turn to the joint stock company, which was followed by the amalgamation of several companies into combinations or trusts. By 1912 "big business" based on big capital had definitely established itself. Those operating on a small scale had to meet this development by increased efficiency. It is quite clear that in this new business era efficient city management will play a large and important part. As transportation facilities improve and as buying is done on an increasingly large scale, markets will be won on smaller and smaller margins. Intelligent municipal action for the development of a city as a whole will lower costs and give that city's business larger market extensions.[1]

Again the strength of a nation depends on the prosperity of the working classes. Productive business gains nothing by a deteriorating people; rather it has everything to gain by a people constantly improving in physical and intellectual power, but this improvement depends on sound municipal administration. A city therefore must develop on efficient lines if it is to progress in competition with its rivals. The certainties in city growth are passing, and in their place are coming the tremendous uncertainties which call for the daring, forward-looking type of mind. The future development of cities must be based on an intelligent programme concerning all those factors, such as housing and public health, which vitally concern the well-being of its people, and upon methods of business efficiency in administration and finance which will protect and develop the business interests which lie within its boundaries. These aims are not contradictory but complementary to each other.

It is, therefore, essential to look round us and discover

[1] For a full discussion of this important question see "American Cities: Their Methods of Business," by A. B. Gilbert (Macmillan, 1918).

the manner in which these problems of muncipal management and development are dealt with elsewhere. In this matter we cannot be content to blindly follow English precedent and example as we so frequently do. Our present system of city government, which is based entirely on English precedents, consists of a large town council of some fifty members elected by districts. This council is subject to the supervision and control of the Local Government Board as regards finance and administration, but it is in practice virtually supreme as long as it acts reasonably. It holds office for three years, elects the mayor and appoints all officials. Its functions are principally administrative; but it has legislative powers as regards bye-laws and other minor matters. For the purpose of carrying out its work it appoints a large number of committees, who deal with the various departments of municipal activity, but whose proceedings must be confirmed by the council as a whole. This system of city government is now obsolete and unsuitable. It cannot accommodate itself to the complex developments of modern business, and it is both inefficient and wasteful in its working. In this article I propose to consider in the light of modern developments how it may be altered and improved.

With the exception of Germany, European countries have not made great changes in their machinery of municipal government during the past century. In Germany the organisation of the municipal executive takes two principal forms. The form used in Northern Germany is commonly known as the "magisterial constitution," under which the executive power is vested in a body which acts collectively and of which the mayor is *ex-officio* the head. Each of its members is an expert and administers his department independently, though when matters have to be decided jointly decision follows the vote of the majority. This executive body is generally elected by the town council, and most of its members

are paid. This form of municipal government corresponds roughly, as will be pointed out later, to the American form of commission government. In Southern Germany the form of municipal executive, which is of French origin, is known as the "Mayoral constitution," and under it the conduct of communial affairs is vested in one officer, the mayor, who is also the chairman of the town council. In the work of administration he is assisted by expert colleagues. He is elected for twelve years and is frequently re-elected, and if successful, holds office for life. He represents the town in all public capacities and official relationships, and is in effect a kind of Pooh-Bah—its Prime Minister, Home Secretary and Foreign Secretary all in one. It is of course a professional and highly paid position, and corresponds in some ways to the American city-manager; but the latter is more directly responsible to the people.[1] Perhaps in no department of affairs has the German faith in the value of science and training been more justified than in local government, for the institution of the permanent executive places at the service of every town a body of skilled experts, each qualified for his work by special knowledge and preparation.

It is commonplace observation [writes Mr. Dawson, the leading English writer on this subject] that German municipal enterprise years ago extended to some directions which are only now being touched in this country. Yet this fact need not excite surprise when it is remembered how long and how well Germany has been served by these special corps of trained men whose business it is not merely to wait on public opinion, which is, as a rule, so little informed as to a community's real needs and truest interests, but to anticipate and to safeguard those interests by the exercise of intelligent foresight, ever influenced in its action not by fugitive exigencies, but by considerations of future and permanent utility and advantage.[2]

---

[1] For fuller details concerning these two forms of German Municipal Government see "Municipal Life and Government in Germany," by W. H. Dawson, pp. 71, 93.

[2] Op. Cit., p. 85.

It is, however, rather to America than to Germany that we must turn for the most recent examples of municipal development on lines at once more democratic and efficient. In this field America has been the world's chief laboratory for political experiment. Though costly, and not always effective or satisfactory, these experiments have been most instructive, and have in the end led to real and notable improvements in the administration of municipal affairs. The most successful of these experiments is the system of city government by a commission with its most recent development, the city-manager plan. There is no evidence to show that these developments arose from a study of German conditions; but their similarity in many respects to the German systems already outlined suggest that directly or indirectly their authors were influenced by them, and having regard to the large number of Germans in America this is not remarkable.

As De Tocqueville pointed out: "Municipal institutions constitute the strength of free nations." [1] But it might be added that they too frequently reveal the weakness of democracy. The history of large municipal councils is in general little more than a record of political manœuvring and local intrigue with a mastery of nothing but the art of wasting time and money. They are ill adapted to the work they have to do. The government of a modern city calls for a compact central authority and efficient business management, both subject in the last analysis to the control of its citizens—in other words, a democratic autocracy. It is this result that the commission form of government aims at obtaining. This striking change in municipal government represents a political revolution of no small importance. It embodies both a protest and a policy; a protest against the old regime in city administration and a policy which aims

[1] "Democracy in America," Vol. I., p. 76.

at securing greater directness of responsibility from men in public office. The history of its development and application is of great interest.

The term "commission form of government" is a generic one now employed in referring to the government of cities administered by a small number of officials exercising both legislative and executive authority in municipal matters. Its origin is not really very modern, for Washington, the Federal Capital of the United States, has been governed by a commission since June, 1878.[1] But this plan grew out of the relation of the national government[2] to this particular city and was not developed or extended to other cities. Its modern development originated at Galveston, Texas, in the year 1901. Prior to that year Galveston was one of the worst governed cities in the United States. Governed by a mayor, various elected officials and a board of aldermen, its municipal history managed to afford illustrations of almost every vice in municipal government. The city debt was allowed to mount steadily, and borrowing to pay current expenses was not uncommon. City departments were managed wastefully, offices of honour and profit were filled with incompetent political placemen, and corruption reigned supreme. The city accounts were unintelligible and the rates high. A large proportion of the citizens, despairing of improvement, had ceased to interest themselves in municipal affairs. Things were in this condition when in September, 1900, nature intervened.

A tidal wave swept in from the Gulf, destroyed about one-third of the city, upset its economic life, and compelled the municipal authorities to face the problem of reconstruction. The city was virtually bankrupt. The principal property owners approached the State legislature and

[1] The Washington Commission consists of three members, two appointed by the Senate for a term of three years, and the third appointed by the President from the army engineers.

[2] "Financial Statistics of Cities," U.S.A. Dept. of Commerce, 1918, p. 45.

requested that for some years at any rate the existing municipal government should be replaced by a commission of five business men. The legislature acceded to the request and passed an Act providing that three of the commissioners should be appointed by the governor of the State and two elected by the people. Two years afterwards this arrangement was altered to permit of all five commissioners being elected by the people. Five commissioners are now elected every two years and manage the entire municipal business of the city. One is called the mayor president and presides at all the meetings. The commissioners by majority vote apportion amongst themselves the four administrative departments into which the city administration is divided—namely, the departments of finance and revenue, water and sewerage, police and fire protection, and streets and public property. The mayor president is not appointed to any special department, but exercises supervision over them all. Each of the other commissioners is directly responsible for the routine direction of one important branch of the city's business. Appointments to the higher official positions are made by the whole commission, appointments to the minor posts by the commissioner in charge of the department concerned.[1]

Although prepared hastily and vesting extensive fiscal powers in a small body of men, the new system was a success from the first. The civic spirit of the stricken community was aroused, its business recovered rapidly and in a very short time the place was again prosperous, financially and otherwise. It became obvious that the commission form of government was worth maintaining permanently. Other cities in Texas came forward and asked the legislature for similar charters, and from Texas the new plan of city government spread throughout the United States. In some cities each commissioner is

[1] "Charter of the City of Galveston as passed by Legislature of Texas, March 30, 1903." (Galveston, 1907).

elected as the head of a designated department; in others the assignment of commissioners to departments is made by the commission itself, except in the case of the presiding officer, who is elected by the people. The latter system, as one would expect, has been found to work best. In twenty cities having the commission form of government the mayors exercise only general supervision as in Galveston, in the other cities the mayor presides over a specified department.[1]

The commission plan is now operating in a large number of different States scattered in all parts of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific.[2] Some of the cities which have adopted it have populations exceeding 50,000, but in general the commission plan seems to appeal more strongly to the smaller urban centres. More than three hundred cities have now adopted it, including such well-known places as New Orleans, Omaha, Atlantic City, Jersey City, Portland, Mobile, Buffalo, Sacramento, Memphis, and Salt Lake City. Six are cities with populations exceeding 200,000, fourteen are cities with populations of 100,000 or over. So great has been its success that the only question in doubt is not whether the other cities of the United States will adopt it, but when.

Its latest and most successful development is known as the commission-manager plan, which aims at securing a greater concentration of administrative responsibility. This plan originated at Dayton, Ohio, in 1914, and owed its origin to the initiative of Mr. John H. Patterson, President of the National Cash Register Company, whose great factory—one of the largest and best-managed in America—is situated in that town. As long ago as 1896 Mr. Patterson pointed out in a public address the necessity for business methods, business organisation and

---

[1] "Financial Statistics of Cities." Op. cit., p. 48.

[2] The only States in which the commission form of government does not now exist are Delaware, Indiana, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont.

publicity as the basis of city government.[1] From the Neighbourhood Improvement Association created by him in the district around his factory there grew a larger movement for improving the government of the city. Dayton was considered an outstanding example of bad city government. The city suffered from incompetence and irresponsibility in administration. The disastrous floods of March, 1913, only accentuated an already obvious need for honest, efficient and responsible city management. A Charter Commission was elected to formulate a new charter for the city.

Five weeks after its election the Commission completed for the approval of the public a city manager charter, and on August 12, 1913, it was adopted by a citizens' plebiscite of two to one. It came into force on July 1, 1914. Under its provisions an elective commission of five members controls all branches of the city's affairs, legislative and administrative, except the schools which are under a separate board. The members of the commission are chosen by popular vote for a four year term, but are subject to recall by an adverse vote at any time after six months of service. The commission governs the city and fixes the rates. It may create or abolish city departments. But it does not directly have anything to do with the actual management of the various departments, nor does it immediately supervise the work of the officials. These responsibilities it delegates to a high official with the title of city-manager, appointed by the commission to hold office during its pleasure and paid a good salary. His duties are fourfold. First of all, in an advisory capacity he attends all meetings of the commission, with the right to be heard and to make recommendations but not to vote. Secondly, he is the enforcer of all regulations and bye-laws. Thirdly, he

1 "The City Manager in Dayton," by C. E. Rightor, p. 2. This book details in a most interesting manner Dayton's experience of four years' city-manager government.

appoints all other city officials and employees (subject, however, to the civil service regulations), and may suspend or dismiss any of them for proper cause. In this connection he assigns to each official his particular work. And, finally, he prepares the annual estimates, submitting them to the commission for action; and he is the general supervisor of all the work done in the various departments and offices, having charge of contracts, the purchase of supplies, and so forth, the details being handled by his subordinates. He is in short the managing director of the city. The first city manager of Dayton, Colonel Henry M. Waite, received a salary of £3,122 a year; but his successor is only paid £1,875.[1] The commissioner who receives the highest number of votes becomes Mayor and presides at the meetings of the Commission. The Mayor receives a salary of £450 a year, the other commissioners £300 a year.

It will be seen that the commission manager plan of city government gives a city approximately the same system of organisation as that of a limited liability company in this country—namely, the shareholders or citizens, a board of directors or commission elected by them, and a general manager selected by the directors who has charge of administration. It assures to a city responsibility and unity of effort in the same degree that these are assured to a company by its plan of organisation. It combines the strong points of democratic and autocratic government—namely, a permanent democratic check on the commission and the manager, the one having to seek election and being liable to recall, and the other being liable to dismissal, and an autocratic executive free during its term of office to manage the city without perpetual interference from a large and unrepresentative council. Since 1914 the city-manager plan or some variation

[1] The position was first offered to several prominent business men of Dayton. When they declined the office, it was offered to Colonel G. W. Goethals at a salary of $25,000. He also declined.

of it has been established in about one hundred American cities. Only two of these, Dayton and Grand Rapids, are places of over 100,000 population, but the list includes a dozen cities of 25,000 or over. Naturally enough the plan has proved most popular in the smaller communities.

City-managership is the most advanced point in the movement, now so general in America, towards government by experts. So far as one may judge from four or five years' experience, it forms a highly valuable, if not an indispensable adjunct to the commission plan of government. It strengthens the latter at its weakest point by insuring a high grade of professional skill at the head of the city's administrative service. The future success of the scheme depends on whether it will be possible to secure the right sort of men for the managerial positions and to keep the appointments outside the vicious circle of political patronage.[1]

Let us now consider how these new developments in municipal government operate in practice. Statistics, in such matters not always infallible, go to show that the per capita levy of property taxes, the cost of government and the gross indebtedness are in most cases materially lower in those cities which have adopted the commission form of government as compared with those of a similar size governed by a mayor and council.[2] But what is to my mind more important than statistics is the experience of actual working. The new system has shown itself possessed of many advantages. The most striking arises from concentration of responsibility. The in-

[1] "The Government of the United States," by W. B. Munro, p. 632. See also Edward A. FitzPatrick's excellent book "Experts in City Government." The title of this book indicates its scope: a number of experts examine various aspects of city government.

[2] See "Comparative financial statistics of cities under council and commission government, 1913-1915." Published by U.S. Bureau of the Census (Washington, 1916). In this return a comparison is made between the tax levies of eight typical mayor and council cities and eight commission governed cities for the year 1915. It shows that the average per capita levy of property taxes for the eight mayor cities was $16.36 as against $12.31 in the commission governed cities or a difference of $4.05 in favour of commission cities.

tolerable scattering of powers, duties, and responsibilities, which the old type of city government promoted to the point of absurdity, has gone. Public opinion is focussed upon a narrow and well-defined area. The voter applies a real and anxious scrutiny to the conduct or misconduct of his representatives. He is no longer soothed by the eloquence of Mr. Raiméis at the meetings of the water-works committee, but wants to know how Mr. Raiméis is managing the waterworks, which is quite a different thing. The new system does not of course guarantee that a city's administration shall be always free from good ground for criticism—no system can do that; but it does guarantee that when the administration is faulty there shall be definite shoulders upon which to lay the blame.

The commission system makes business methods possible in city administration. What business would succeed if it was governed by a debating society of 60 members elected by districts and not by the shareholders at large? Of course city administration is not altogether a matter of business. A city must give its people the sort of administration they want, which is not always the best or cheapest; but even allowing for this, and the commission system does allow for it, there is much room for the application of business methods and principles to municipal machinery.

Again, the commission system reduces administrative friction and delay, two of the principal vices of democratic government. There is said to be wisdom in a multitude of counsellors, but the history of municipal councils does not warrant the impression that this is of a very high grade. To say these large councils display greater regard for the interests of the people or more conservative judgment in the handling of questions of policy than do small commissions of five first-class men is to talk arrant nonsense. A small commission of five members offers a reasonable possibility of despatch in the handling of

public business, for it removes the incentive to speech-making and fruitless debate and affords little opportunity for resort to those subterfuges in procedure which serve mainly to create endless friction and delay.

But the chief merit of the commission form of government is that it improves the quality of municipal councillors and municipal officials. In the last analysis, municipal administration, like so many other problems of government, is as much a question of men as of measures. When responsibility is concentrated in a small body and when the management of definite municipal undertakings is delegated to definite individuals, the voter is careful to select competent men. If he does not, their incompetence is soon apparent, and responsibility for its results cannot be shirked. The incompetent city commissioner cannot camouflage his incompetence in a cloud of oratory or invective, nor will a long-winded resolution blind the electors to the deficit in the balance sheet of the department for which he is responsible. If municipal authority can be massed in the hands of five men, each of these men has an opportunity to become a real power in the community, which is the only motive that will draw capable men into public service.

It is only natural that such a transformation in methods of municipal government should meet with objections and criticisms. It has of course been branded as anti-democratic, oligarchical and un-American. These criticisms have in reality no foundation. A body is not undemocratic because it is small in numbers; it is undemocratic when it is not under the voter's direct and effective control. It may almost be accepted as an unanswerable axiom that the smaller an elective body, the more thorough its accountability to the electorate. Against this supreme advantage the advocates of the old order can hardly set off a large council of mediocrities representing narrow ward interests and controlled by a few political bosses for their own selfish ends.

Again it is urged that commission government is not representative, that five men chosen at large cannot represent the many and varied interests of a large city. But one may ask are such interests ever properly represented, and if they were would not the result be merely absurd and lead to chaos? The interests of the whole city, which is what really matters, would be reduced, as they often are at present, to face a mêlée of sectional and personal prejudices. Popular sentiment is not difficult to ascertain when a public man takes the trouble to ascertain it. Five men can surely do it more quickly and accurately than fifty. Large councils give adequate representation indeed, but to one interest only—the machine of the dominant political party.

Another argument used is that a small commission is more easily influenced or corrupted than a large council. This argument rests on the fallacy that sinister influences are applied to the members of a council one by one, whereas it is notorious that it is the leaders, and not the rank and file of a council, who are so influenced. A few masterful individuals without scruple, sometimes one such individual, can and do control an entire council, and these individuals are often not members of the council at all, so that they have power without responsibility. It is these bosses that work the machine. But under the commission system the corrupter of public life has to deal with five men who are free to act as they think fit, but who are under the full glare of the public limelight and who are personally accountable for their actions.

The real defects of the commission plan are that it fails to make full use of expert service in handling the regular work of the city, and that it places the administrative power of the city into too many hands. To meet these defects the commission-manager plan already outlined has been devised.[1] This plan has the further

[1] For a full exposition of the merits and shortcomings of the commission and commission-manager plans see Professor W. B. Munro's indispensable volumes "Government of American Cities" and "The Government of the United States," to both of which I am much indebted.

merit of creating unity of administrative functions and focussing responsibility on an even narrower field. By putting the several active departments of the city government under a city manager, with the power of appointment and dismissal in his hands, the city assures itself that these will work together in the direction determined through the commission by its citizens. When the manager plans out and obtains sanction for a certain course of action he has in his hands all the offices or functions necessary to carry out that activity. He has moreover no other business or responsibility to distract him from the task. The citizens know exactly where to look for lack of performance. Time is saved and municipal business carried on efficiently. It has been found in practice that with a good city manager the commission of a small city can despatch its business with four hours of meeting a month. They have only to go through reports carefully and outline the policy for future work.

With the manager plan has been introduced the budget system. The manager prepares and submits to the commission an annual budget on the basis of the estimates of the various departments of the city. These estimates show the expenses for the preceding year and the probable increase or diminution for the ensuing year. This budget must be published in the local papers two weeks before it is discussed by the commission and must be discussed by it at a public meeting. The budget is the plan for the future; it expresses in definite form what the city hopes to do for the coming year; it balances liabilities and assets, expenditures and incomes, one activity against another. It gives directness and system to the whole year's work. No citizen can excuse ignorance of city affairs under such conditions. The sinister forces in every city thrive on bad and secret municipal accounting. Budgets of this sort prepared year after year, show whether a city is paying for its improvement as it goes or is piling up a debt against posterity.

But, like all other institutions in this imperfect world, both the commission and city manager plans have their human limitations. To hope that they will prove self-executing instruments of civic righteousness is to avow an optimism that betokens small knowledge of man as a political animal. What is rightly claimed for them is that they are a big step forward on the road to civic efficiency, that they disclose the shoulders upon which the onus of incompetency should lie, and that they afford independence and personal qualifications at least a fighting chance which they do not receive under the present municipal system. Above all they simplify, in these days of increasing complications, the task of the individual voter, and create a city government the workings of which he can understand. On all these grounds I advocate their application to Irish civic conditions as and when opportunity occurs. The municipal elections have just given us new urban authorities throughout Ireland, and I see no reason why any of them that choose should not, even within the limits of the existing law, delegate their powers to a small committee of the whole council making each member of the committee responsible for a department of municipal government. It is perhaps unreasonable to suggest to our new municipal rulers such speedy immolation; but I am quite convinced that, if our cities and towns are to attain a more efficient municipal government, our present system must be radically altered. Pending such alteration the present councils can easily experiment and investigate concerning the line it should take, and for this purpose the American systems I have described are fertile in example and results.

JOHN J. HORGAN.

PALESTINIAN CUSTOMS AS ILLUSTRATING THE BIBLE.

BY EDMOND POWER, S.J., D.LITT.ORIENT.

Professor of Biblical Archæology, Biblical Institute, Rome.

Part II.[1]

OUR first article on Palestinian customs as illustrating the Bible dealt with the care of sheep, the raising of corn and the preparation of bread. These are vital operations for the Palestinian peasant, because they provide him with his staple food, bread and milk. Next in importance is the cultivation of the vine, the fig and the olive, which procure him the necessary condiment for his food. And bread, milk and condiment are intimately bound up with the conditions regulating the holding and distribution of the land, the great source of supply. Thus customs connected with fruit-trees and land-tenure come next under consideration. They will be found to explain and illustrate many Biblical passages and points of view, and will complete our study of the land and its products in their relation to the Bible.

The vine was even more wide-spread in Palestine in ancient times than it is at present, as names of places and abandoned wine-presses testify. It is particularly at home on the hill-sides and on the gentle slopes at the foot of the hills. As it requires more careful preparation and more constant attention than any other Palestinian

[1] Part I. appeared in the issue of September, 1919.

product, the prophets and Our Divine Lord himself chose the figure of the vineyard to express God's extraordinary care for His chosen people.[1] The ground has first to be cleared of thorns and stones. Isaias alludes to this operation. The stones help to make the loose wall, often topped with a hedge, which surrounds the vineyard, and which must be constantly repaired, as it is easily undermined by the winter rains. "I passed by the vineyard of the slothful man . . . and the stone wall was broken down," says the author of the Book of Proverbs.[2] Balaam, riding on his ass, was stopped by the Angel of the Lord in the narrow winding path between two such vineyard walls.[3] Isaias mentions both wall and hedge in his similitude, and Our Lord uses a general term, meaning fence or barrier, which includes both, though it is rendered "hedge" in our Douay version.

The whole vineyard must be carefully ploughed after the beginning of the winter rains, or the vines will rapidly degenerate. And they will bear little or no fruit if they are not well pruned in spring-time. More ploughing or hoeing is necessary at this period to remove the weeds, and purging[4] is again required in April or May when the fragrant[5] blossoms appear. The vineyard must now be assiduously watched, or jackals, foxes, dogs and robbers will deprive the vintner of the fruit of his labours.[6] The watchman[7] and his hut or tower are familiar figures in the east, and are frequently mentioned in the Bible. The hut is often merely a low booth, made of four stout poles fixed in the ground with boarding lashed across half-way up and a roof of leaves and branches. The frail character of this structure is alluded to by Job when he says of the wicked man: "Like the spider he has built his house, and like the booth which a watchman has made."[8] At

[1] Isaias v. 1 sq.; Ps. lxxix. 9 sq.; Matt. xxi. 33 sq. [2] Proverbs xxiv. 30-31. [3] Num. xxii. 24. [4] John xv. 2. [5] Cant. ii. 13. [6] Lam. v. 18; Cant. ii. 15; Nehem. iv. 3. [7] Cant. i. 6 etc. [8] Job xxvii. 18 (correcting the Hebrew and Vulgate "moth" after the Greek and Syriac "spider," *Cf.* Job viii. 14).

other times it is constructed of loose stones, the hut proper, roofed with branches, forming the upper storey. This is the tower of the Gospel and of the prophet Isaias. It must be particularly strong when the vineyard is at a distance from the village, as often happens, and robbers are much to be feared.

The grapes begin to ripen about the middle of June in the plains and a month later in the hill country. Then comes the joyous season of the vintage, when the grapes are gathered and pressed to the accompaniment of merriment and song.[1] The grapes may be eaten fresh, or dried and preserved for winter use, or made into a kind of syrup or molasses, or lastly made into wine. As wine is prohibited by the Mohammedan law, very little of it is made by the Palestinian natives at the present day. The Arabs who drink it have a special predilection for a sweet strong wine prepared from grapes that have been left a fortnight in the sun before being pressed. This is very probably the "sweet wine," which the Apostles were mockingly accused of having drunk to excess on Pentecost Sunday.[2] St. Peter's answer to the charge, that it was the third hour of the day or only about nine o'clock, appears much less forcible to us than it did to his Jewish hearers. The Apostle alluded to the rigorous custom forbidding Jews to drink wine before the morning prayer in the synagogue which took place at that hour. It is interesting to observe here that the general abandonment of wine-making in Palestine is due, in the first instance, to Mohammed's adoption of this Jewish custom, which he promulgated in the Koran in the very words of the Talmud[3] and transformed later on into an absolute prohibition of the intoxicating juice of the grape.

The vat or wine-press, mentioned in Isaias and in

[1] Isaias xvi. 10. [2] Acts ii. 13. [3] Sura iv. 46. *Cf.* Talmudic Commentaries to the Mishna Tracts, Berakhoth v. 1; Erubin vi. 1-2; Goldschmidt, *Der Babylonische Talmud*, i. 115; ii. 210, 213.

the Gospel, is a shallow rectangular depression in the hard rock about four feet square and sloping to one corner. There it usually communicates with a smaller but deeper receptacle to hold the juice expressed from the grapes in the larger one. These vats are now very extensively used for making the thick syrup or molasses called dibs. The grapes are sprinkled with powdered whitish clay, and are either enclosed in sacks or covered with stones when trodden under foot in the wine-press. The juice expressed is carefully boiled down for thirty-six hours to about a third of its original volume, the surface being meanwhile frequently skimmed of the lighter impurities that arise. Then the liquid is let cool; and after the heavier impurities have been precipitated to the bottom with the white clay powder, it is carefully poured off. The sweet brown-coloured syrup subsequently crystallises and is much used as a condiment.

Was this grape syrup made by the ancient Hebrews? There are probable but not certain reasons for thinking that it was. The Hebrew word for honey, *debash*, is the exact phonetical equivalent of the Arabic *dibs* and the Syriac *debsh*. Hence while *debash* certainly means in some passages the natural honey of the bee, it may very well also have designated, at times, the artificial honey of the grape like its Syriac and Arabic equivalents. Such according to many authors is probably its meaning in the two passages of the Old Testament in which honey is mentioned with three or four other characteristic Palestinian products as an important export to Egypt and Phoenicia.[1] Bee-keeping was apparently unknown in Palestine, though wild honey was very abundant; and one naturally expects the vines, for which Palestine was famous, to have supplied an article of exportation. The description of Palestine as a "land flowing with milk and honey[2]" is referred also by some authors to the flocks

[1] Genesis xliii. 11; Ezechiel xxvii. 17.

[2] Exodus iii. 8, etc.

and the vines. But there is much reason to think that these well-known words are not meant to be a literal enumeration of the chief food-stuffs of Palestine, but rather a poetical and proverbial phrase implying that the promised land possessed all good things in abundance. It would appear from many Arabic and some Babylonian texts that "milk and honey" were to the Semites what nectar was to the Greeks and Romans, an ideal food, the food of the blessed.[1] The beloved says of the spouse in the Canticle: "Honey and milk are under thy tongue;"[2] and conversely St. Agnes declares in the breviary that she received honey and milk from the lips of Christ—"mel et lac ex ore ejus suscepi." A land like Palestine, richly supplied with every kind of food, might well appear an earthly paradise to the Israelites in the desert.

The grapes preserved for winter use are first softened and prevented from burning by being steeped in a lye of ashes that remain after the burning of some hard wood like oak or terebinth. They are then dried in the sun. Clusters of raisins and cakes of figs are often mentioned as a condiment with bread in the Old Testament. They formed, for instance, part of the rich present with which the prudent Abigail mollified the wrath of David against her husband Nabal.[3]

The fig-tree is very common in Palestine. It is frequently planted in vineyards, where it does not interfere with the fertility of the vine. Its large leaves are, of course, no longer used for garments as in the garden of Eden,[4] but they still afford agreeable shade. The peasant reposing under his own vine and fig-tree is a familiar figure in the Old Testament;[5] and similarly Our Lord tells us in one of his parables how a certain man

[1] *Cf.* especially I. Guidi, *Une Terre Coulant du Lait avec du Miel*, Revue Biblique, 1903, p. 241 sq., and P. H. Hänsler O.S.B., *Noch einmal "Honig im hl. Lande,"* Zeitschrift des Palästina Vereins, xxxv. (1912), p. 186 sq. There is quite a literature on this subject in Biblical reviews and reference books.

[2] Cant. iv. 11. [3] 1 Kings xxv. 18. [4] Gen. iii. 7.

[5] Micheas iv. 4; 3 Kings iv. 25 etc.

had a fig-tree planted in his vineyard.[1] Nothing similar is ever said of the olive, which is very rarely to be seen in a vineyard as it would deprive the vines of their nourishment.

The fig-tree requires much less care than the vine and more than the olive. The ground about the trees must be occasionally ploughed and hoed, and the produce is increased by grafting. The figs are either eaten fresh, or dried and preserved for winter use, as in Scriptural times.[2] The regular crop of figs, which grows each year on all sound fig-trees, is ripe in August; but a few may still be found on the trees in the month of December. The early figs, which grow underneath the leaves and are not to be found on all fig-trees, ripen in June. These are large, juicy and highly prized by the present inhabitants of Palestine. We can thus understand why the prophet Hoseas likens the Israelites before their idolatry at Beelphegor to "the first fruits of the fig-tree on the top thereof."[3] Similarly Jeremias compares the Jews who were chastened by the Babylonian captivity to "very good figs, those of the first season," while those who remained in Palestine or went down into Egypt were like "bad figs that cannot be eaten.[4]" The Apocalypse alludes to the fact that most of these early figs fall from the trees while still green.[5]

There is one passage in the New Testament which has caused very great difficulty to many thoughtful readers.[6] The early figs, as we have seen, only ripen in June, while the regular crop entirely disappears from the trees by January at latest. How was it than that Our Lord early in Holy Week came to a fig-tree on the Bethany road and sought figs on it to satisfy his hunger? And why did he condemn it to barrenness for bearing no fruit at a time which St. Mark expressly tells us was not the time for figs? The rationalistic critics cut the knot by

[1] Luke xiii. 6. [2] 1 Kings xxv. 18; xxx. 12, etc. [3] Hoseas ix. 10.
[4] Jeremias xxiv. 2. [5] Apoc. vi. 13. [6] Mark xi. 12 *sq.*; Matt. xxi. 18 *sq.*

regarding the whole episode as unhistorical. Serious students of Palestinian customs have found a more satisfactory solution of the difficulty. Already in February the early figs begin to manifest themselves on some, but not on all trees. Their appearance denotes the close of winter in the Canticle of Canticles.[1] Soon after the delicate fragrant leaves begin to appear—a well-known sign of the approach of summer, as Our Lord in another passage reminds us.[2] The figs are bigger than cherries in the beginning of April, and, even at this period, are often plucked off and eaten by the peasants; for the Easterns have a curious liking for unripe fruit. A missionary long resident in Palestine informs us that peasants, who came to him in the morning for medicine, often replied to the usual question as to whether they had eaten anything: "Nothing, except a few early figs."

Let us turn now to the Gospel story. The southerly site and abundant leaves of the tree to which Our Lord came gave every promise of unripe early figs. But it was one of those trees which bore no early figs, though it would, in the ordinary course of events, have produced a full crop of the later ones when the regular time came round. The disappointment of Our Lord at the absence of the figs and the explanation of their absence given by the Evangelist are thus equally natural. How wonderfully apt, on the other hand, was this fig-tree to represent the Jewish nation! The Jews were the specially favoured of all races. They were the first to be evangelised. From them the first and best fruits were to be expected. The leaves of external observance and exaggerated zeal for the law abounded. But the fruits of charity and internal holiness were not to be found. And leaves without fruit only signified wasted opportunities and hypocritical ostentation. That the Jews might have borne fruit later on, if left to be gathered in with the Gentiles at the regular harvest, was irrelevant. In the words of Christ

[1] Cant. ii. 13.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 32; Mark xiii. 28.

himself " they had not known the time of their visitation"[1]; and so as a nation they were rejected.

The olive-tree is the most lucrative and the least troublesome agricultural asset of Palestine. The climate suits it perfectly, the long dry summer giving the fruit full time to ripen. Too late rain, too early heat and too fierce sirocco are its only enemies. It grows abundantly all over the country, even between hard rocks where it gets coolness and moisture. The Israelites might, in the words of Deuteronomy, " suck oil from the hardest rock."[2] It lasts many centuries and requires little or no labour, only an occasional trimming of the leaves and ploughing of the soil in its vicinity. Sometimes, too, the earth is heaped about the stem for coolness and nourishment. A Palestinian proverb, referring to the care and attention required in cultivation, likens the vine to a city-lady, the fig to a country-woman and the olive to a roving Bedouin dame. The olive requires free space to develop its wide roots and, unlike the fig and the vine, permits no other plant in its neighbourhood. It has also the special peculiarity of shooting up slips from its roots, sometimes five or six in number, in a circle round about it. This property of the olive is alluded to in a well-known verse of the hundred and twenty-eighth Psalm, where the Psalmist finely enumerates, among the blessings of the God-fearing man, " thy sons like slips of olive round about thy table."[3] It is even said that the central trunk is called " the table " by some Palestinians. Trees, which are grown from the slips when transplanted or more rarely from seeds, must be grafted when the olive blooms in the late spring-time. A healthy twig, having a rectangular piece of bark about two inches square attached to it, is inserted in an incision made in the bark of the young tree. The bark is then closed in and bound tightly down on the graft; if all goes well, the upper part of the bough is subsequently lopped off that the sap may go entirely

[1] Luke xix. 44. [2] Deut. xxxii. 13. [3] Ps. cxxviii. 3.

to the good part. St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans alludes to the practice of olive-grafting.[1] He compares the Gentiles to a slip of wild olive grafted on the stock of the Patriarchs, and warns them that they should not glory over the Jews, who are the natural branches of the tree. The Apostle expressly says that this operation is contrary to nature. And as a matter of fact wild olives are never grafted on good trees by the present Palestinian peasants, though the Latin writer, Columella,[2] refers to such a practice as sometimes employed with the object of strengthening the good tree.

The olives are ripe in October, when they are mostly beaten off the trees with rods. This method of gathering the fruit is mentioned in Deuteronomy.[3] The few remaining on the tree may now, as in former times, be gleaned by the poor.[4] To such does the prophet Isaias compare the remnant of Judah.[5] Many of the olives are eaten fresh and, being preferred a little green, are gathered early. Those used for oil must be first crushed and then pressed. The crushing is done in a kind of mortar.[6] The olives are placed in a hollow in the centre of a circular horizontal stone and an upper stone is moved round over them by hand or otherwise. The crushed olives are then usually pressed in a vat, somewhat similar to the wine-press,[7] until all the oil has flown forth and been received in leathern bags or earthen jars. The word Gethsemani means oil-press. The name is a sadly realistic one, for it was in the garden of Gethsemani amid the olive-trees that Our Lord's agony forced the precious blood from his sacred body.

An olive-tree is fruitful at seven years and is in full bearing power at fourteen. It produces, if big, in alternate years $2\frac{1}{2}$ cwt. of olives, which give $5\frac{1}{2}$ gallons of oil. The oil is still used, as in Biblical times, for food,

---

[1] Romans xi. 17-24. [2] De Re Rustica v. 9. [3] Deut. xxiv. 20. [4] *ibidem.*
[5] Isaias xvii. 6; xxiv. 13. [6] Exodus xxvii. 20; xxix. 40. [7] Micheas vi. 15.

light, medicine,[1] salve, and for rubbing over the whole body to strengthen it.[2] Olive-oil was a very important Palestinian export to Phoenicia and Egypt in ancient times.[3] It is chiefly from his olives that the present-day peasant gets the money to pay his taxes. A bad olive crop is a more serious misfortune than a bad corn harvest. All this will help us to understand why the olive is the first chosen to be king of trees in the parable of Joatham ;[4] why Judah devastated is compared to an olive struck by lightning in the prophecy of Jeremias ;[5] why wisdom in Ecclesiasticus,[6] prosperity in the Psalms,[7] beauty in Hoseas,[8] are all symbolised by this precious tree ; why holy men in Israel, like Simon the son of Onias in Ecclesiasticus,[9] the high-priest Jesus and the prince Zorobabel in Zachary,[10] and the two witnesses of Christ in the Apocalypse,[11] are represented as flourishing olive-trees.

The other products of the land in Palestine are of less importance for the understanding of the Bible and would not justify us in prolonging this article to an unreasonable length. Before concluding, however, it may be well to point out a few interesting comments on Biblical texts to be gleaned from the system of land tenure which obtained in Palestine before the break-up of the Ottoman Empire.

There were four different classes of land in Palestine. The land in possession of, or secured by inheritance to mosques, churches, schools and similar institutions was called *wakf* and could not be alienated except by special permission of the Sheikh-ul-Islam or Minister of Religion at Constantinople. This was a modern institution of Moslem law, having no relation with ancient Palestinian customs.

The greater part of the country was crown land, the property of the state, which was rented out for cultivation

[1] Isaias i. 6 ; Mark vi. 13 ; Luke x. 34. [2] Deut. xxviii. 40 ; Dan. xiii. 17 ; Ps. cxl. 5 etc. [3] Hoseas xii. 2 ; 3 Kings v. 11 ; Ezechiel xxvii. 17 etc. [4] Judges ix. 8. [5] Jer. xi. 16. [6] Ecclesiasticus xxiv. 19. [7] Ps. li. 10. [8] Hoseas xiv. 7. [9] Eccl. l. 11. [10] Zach. iv. 3, 11. [11] Apoc. xi. 4.

on condition that a tenth of the produce was paid to the government. Such land could not be sold or built on by the tenants; but the right to cultivate a certain portion might be disposed of, and a simple residence might be put up by the cultivator. Men still living remember the time when government land in the neighbourhood of villages was owned by the villages. As late as 1918 it was often rented by the villages in common. In the latter case, as formerly, an allotment between the different cultivators took place each year. The land was first divided, according to its value, into good, bad and indifferent portions. These were subdivided into lots, according to the number of cultivators, so that each received a portion of good, bad and indifferent soil. A common method of allotment was to draw from a little bag pebbles bearing marks to indicate the different lots and hand them to the different individuals. Each on receiving his pebble, before yet knowing the exact place indicated, said: "This is my lot"; and added: "May God maintain my lot."[1] His happiness would be great if he subsequently discovered that the lines marking out his lot enclosed an advantageous site. The Psalmist had some such allotment in mind when he said: "Jahweh is the share of my portion and my cup. Thou art the maintainer of my lot. The lines have fallen for me on pleasant places. My heritage is indeed a goodly one."[2] The words of the Hebrew text, "Thou art the maintainer of my lot," still echoed by the Palestinian peasant, are slightly different in the Vulgate, which in the Psalms follows the Septuagint, 'Thou art he that will restore my inheritance to me." The passage is familiar to us all from its use in conferring tonsure and admitting to the *clerus* or lot.

The boundary of the different lots was marked by a double furrow with a heap of stones at either end. To these boundary-stones the prophet Hoseas compared the

[1] Robinson Lees, *Village Life*, p. 137-8.

[2] Ps. xv. 5-6.

idolatrous altars of the Israelites, probably in allusion to their great number: "Their altars are as stone-heaps in the furrows of the field.[1]" The thief or mischief-maker who interferes with these boundary marks will not receive the blessings of the villagers. "Accursed is the man who removes his neighbour's landmarks," we read in Deuteronomy, "and all the people shall say 'Amen.'[2]"

The free-hold land once so common in Israel, as the story of Naboth's vineyard reminds us, is to-day, if we exclude house property, represented only by small tracts in the immediate neighbourhood of villages. A peasant may freely sell or purchase such land, and it is interesting to note that, when a sale takes place, all or some of the trees on the land are often retained by the former owner. This shows us that the special mention of the trees in the first recorded sale of land in Palestine nearly four thousand years ago is not mere verbiage, but a very necessary stipulation. Abraham bought for four hundred shekels of silver "the field of Ephron in Macphelah looking towards Mambre, both it and the cave and all the trees thereof in all its limits round about.[3]"

Finally there is the unappropriated land left to the free use of people in general or of certain villages in particular. Roads and especially pasturages fall under this head. Thus while the corn-land mostly belongs to the government, and the fruit and vegetable gardens are often free-hold, the grazing land is common property. This explains how shepherds travel with their flocks over wide tracts of country in modern as in ancient times. Some rationalists consider the frequent changes of residence of the shepherd-patriarchs of Israel as inconsistent with the settled character of the country and sufficient to brand the Genesis narratives as myths. But the present-day custom cannot be called impossible or denied a greater extension at a time when Palestine was less widely cultivated and less thickly inhabited.

[1] Hoseas xii. 11. [2] Deut. xxvii. 17. [3] Gen. xxiii. 17.

Like the flocks of sheep and goats, the oxen and the asses of the villagers are herded during the day in the free pasturages of the open country. They are all driven back together to the entrance of the village by the common herdsman in the evening, and thence the different animals are allowed to find their way unaided to the stables of their several owners. Their success in so doing is alluded to by the prophet Isaias in a familiar text: "The ox knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib; but Israel knoweth not, my people understandeth not." [1] The passage is not a prophecy of the presence of the ox and the ass at Our Saviour's birth. Not a single Patristic commentator has so understood it.

Ancient Israel, if faithful to God, was promised in reward the prosperity that flowed from the productivity of the soil of Palestine. Sin and infidelity, on the other hand, were to be visited also on the land and its products. Habacuc, who prophesied the Babylonian captivity, thus describes the punishment of Palestine itself for the crimes of its unfaithful and idolatrous inhabitants: "The fig-tree beareth not, there is no produce in the vines, the fruit of the olive-tree faileth and the fields give forth no food, the sheep are cut off from the fold and there are no oxen in the stalls.[2]" And similarly the land has had to atone for the rejection of Christ and Christianity down to the present day. Its soil has constantly deteriorated, and its people have been debarred from the benefits of modern progress.

Has this period of affliction now come to an end with the break-up of the Ottoman Empire? It is impossible yet to say. When we have completed this series of articles, perhaps we shall then be in a position to draw some definite conclusion. Our next contribution will treat of customs connected with births, marriages and deaths in ancient and modern Palestine.

EDMOND POWER.

[1] Isaias i. 3. [2] Habacuc iii. 17.

TWO BISHOPS OF KILLALOE AND IRISH FREEDOM.

John O'Molony I.—(1630-1651).

BY JAMES HOGAN.

IN the middle of the 16th century there lived one John O'Molony in Thomond. He married probably about 1575, and had three children—two sons and one daughter. John and Thomas were the names of the sons; Margaret was the name of his daughter. John, the eldest son, subsequently became Bishop of Killaloe, and it is his chequered career that I propose to examine in this article.

Three contemporary records enable us to establish a relationship between John O'Molony and the main branch of the clan Molony. We know that Malachias O'Molony, Bishop of Kilmacduagh (1576-1613), was a kinsman of the last baron of Glanmullan, chief of the clan Molony; and we also know that John O'Molony, in a letter to the Holy See (1630), claimed relationship with this Malachias. It is true that Richard Arthur, Bishop of Limerick, denied the claim. "No doubt," he writes to the Holy See, "John O'Molony comes of good and honest parents; but he is neither of noble race nor a relation of the most reverend Bishop of Kilmacduagh." But two other contemporary documents make it manifest that O'Molony's claim to be a relation of Malachias is well-founded.

The first of these is *De Praesulibus Hiberniae*, an invaluable storehouse of 17th century church history. It was written about 1672 by John Lynch, author of

Cambrensis Eversus, the most prolific Catholic writer in the 17th century and a man of great erudition. Of the *De Praesulibus Hiberniae* there are three unpublished manuscripts in existence—one in the Mazarin Library, Paris; another in the Bodleian, Oxford; the third in Trinity College, Dublin. Lynch, who has always been recognised as an authority of a very high order, gives an elaborate sketch of the life of O'Molony, connecting him with many of the nobility of Thomond and in particular with the eminent "Baron of the clan Molony." They have the same heraldic crest, he says, "a shield with two lions rampant on one boss and on the other an archer with bended bow."

For the third authority we have to seek further afield. Margaret O'Molony, John's only sister, married Moilin Mac Brody about 1610, and lived at her husband's house at Moynoe, Co. Clare. In the course of a few years a son, Antony, was born to them, and when he grew up he became the famous disputator, Father Antony Mac Brody. He wrote with great voluminousness, and about 1668 the *Propugnaculum Catholicae Veritatis* came from his pen. In this work he tells us many things about his own family, and describes how when he was yet in the cradle there came to his father's house, the Bishop of Kilmacduagh, Malachias O'Molony, asking for shelter, and how he remained with them till his death in 1613. It is extremely probable that Malachias O'Molony came to the house of Mac Brody because of Margaret Molony, Mac Brody's wife, and that they gave him shelter because of their relationship. If this be correct, then O'Molony's claim to be a relative of Malachias O'Molony, and in consequence to belong to the parent stem of the Molony clan, is quite legitimate.

Returning to the *De Praesulibus Hiberniae*, we find there many of the intimate details of O'Molony's childhood and youth, which (as far as I know) are given nowhere else. Lynch's father, Alexander, set up a school

in Galway in the late 16th century. Here O'Molony passed his earlier years. This school is an interesting and in many respects a unique example of the efforts which the Irish never ceased to make, even in the periods of bitterest warfare and confusion, to satisfy the thirst for knowledge. These schools sprang up in a day, ran a short and brilliant course; but they could not long escape discovery, and so of a surety some day the English soldiers would come down and dismantle or fire them. Lynch's school was a more ambitious attempt to supply a wide and general education than any of the others. It was organised as thoroughly as any of the continental colleges. You had the usual division of classes into Poetry, Rhetoric and Philosophy. But what makes this school most worthy of notice is the survival of the "educational drama," which had been so flourishing in the early Renaissance, but which had been long since supplanted by other forms of mind-culture on the Continent.

Much could be written about Lynch's methods and success; but we are concerned only with his pupil, O'Molony, who was not allowed to enjoy long the advantages of school life. In 1615 Lord Chancellor Thomas Jones descended on Galway and ordered Lynch to conform to the established religion or to close his school.[1] O'Molony was now taken into the house of Andrew Lynch, then a young priest and later Bishop of Kilfenora (1647-1673).[2] Lynch continued the education of the boy until

[1] Hardiman in his *West Connaught* gives the following extract from Jones's report of his visitation: "Wee found in Galway a publique schoolmaster, named Lynch, placed there by the citizens, who had great numbers of schollers, not only out of the province but also out of the Pale and other partes resorting to him. Wee had daily proofe, during our continuance in that city, how well his schollers profited under him by the verses and orations which they presented us. Wee sent for that schoolmaster and seriously advised him to conform to the religion established, and, not prevailing with our advice, we enjoyned him to forbear teaching."

[2] Rinuccini, in his report to the Holy See (Aug. 11, 1646) on vacant Sees in Ireland, wrote: "No better man can be found for Kilfenora than Andrew Lynch, of whom I continue to hear from everyone the most favourable reports." (Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, p. 350).

his guardians, finding him disposed to be a priest, sent him to Paris.

At this period Paris was becoming more and more the Mecca for the persecuted and exiled Irish. Since the days of Hugh O'Neill the Irish, when hard pressed, had invariably sought an alliance with England's most inveterate enemy on the Continent. Their first choice was Spain, but the glories of Spain had gradually declined for half a century, and the star of France was now in the ascendant. Consequently an alliance with France became the goal of Irish endeavours down to 1691, and it is because the two Molonys, uncle and nephew, played an important part in this drama that I have selected their careers for special study. Whether the subject of the present article clearly foresaw that goal or was only an unconscious actor in the drama, the reader must judge for himself. It is a debatable question, because the real *dénouement* took place long after his death.

In the beginning of the 17th century, although the Sorbonne contained large numbers of Irish students, yet they laboured under the serious disadvantage of having no corporate life either there or in the city.[1] As early as 1576 a small band of Irish students under Father John Lee had been attached to the college Montaigu; but at the time of O'Molony's arrival they still suffered from the lack of college buildings or corporate existence.[2] They lodged, it appears, up and down the city, the greater number in the Latin quarter in order to be in the vicinity of the University. We have no knowledge under whose protection these young Irishmen were placed. But in a city like Paris, unless one were locked up in a convent, life was various and instructive, and often perilous for the morals of the young.

O'Molony was not without company. He had fellow-countrymen of his own—Malachy O'Queely and David

---

[1] Boyle: *Irish College* (Paris), p. 4.

[2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

Molony[1]—at the University. They all attended lectures at the Berodiano (College of Boncour), and afterwards passed to the Grassins, a constituent College of the Sorbonne, then famous for the high standard of its scholarship and for the great Frenchmen it had educated. O'Molony excelled in his studies, and attracted much notice in the University. Among the Irish he signalised himself by a strong religious spirit, and even when yet very young he used to call them apart and preach to them. All the records we have read about the lives of Irishmen in Paris in those days dwell on the necessities and temptations to which they were constantly subject. O'Molony would seem to have been of a serious turn of mind from his boyhood, and it reflects great credit on his talents that he, a simple student, could lecture his fellow students and obtain a hearing from them. In the college of Grassins he took the degree of Bachelor of Theology, and a few years later the degree of Master of Theology.[2] Having finished his studies, he retired to live in the neighbourhood of Paris.

From this retreat he was promoted, about 1615, to the chair of philosophy in the Grassins. A higher academic honour could be conferred on no man. For five years or so O'Molony continued to lecture in this College, and when we remember that Bossuet and Fénélon would have then been students, and that France (of which the Sorbonne was the pulse) was about to enter on an epoch of astonishing intellectual fertility, we can appraise the position to which this Irishman had attained by his own unaided efforts.

In the year 1620 O'Molony was selected for the office of Procurator in the Sorbonne. To become Procurator one had to be a Master of Arts of three years' standing. The Procurator held office for four months, was a member of the Rector's council, and generally assisted in the

[1] *Irish College* (Paris), p. 20. The reader will hear more about these two Irishmen at a later stage.

[2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.* [3] *Ibid.*

administration of the University. This post, needless to say, was very honourable and much ambitioned. The Procurators were the heads of the four "Nations"—the French, the Normans, the Picards, and the Germans—into which the Faculty of Arts was divided. The common head of the four Nations was styled Rector. O'Molony was Procurator of the German Nation, which embraced all the students from the north and east of Europe.[1] The Masters of Arts were accustomed to have a certain number of meetings each year, over which the Procurator presided. From the rolls of the University we have evidence that O'Molony acted as chairman and secretary to the deliberations of the German Nation, the minutes of which are still preserved written and signed in his own handwriting.[2]

About 1620 also the movement to start a seminary for the Irish began. The principal steps were first to secure recognition from the University and then from the Court. Dr. Dease and Dr. Messingham were the main promoters of the scheme, but in the negotiations with the University and the Royal authorities they probably had an intermediary. Who he was is stated nowhere. The natural person to negotiate with the University was O'Molony, because he was a professor of philosophy and a member of the governing body. A circumstance which lends support to this conclusion occurred in 1625. In that year the Rector of the Sorbonne made the first official visitation of the new Seminary, and it was O'Molony who showed him round. The Rector, having made prolonged inquiries into the state of the college, complained that all the members of the Seminary, with the exception of three, were from the diocese of Meath, and the Superior, Dr. Messingham, was reminded that

[1] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae; Registre de la nation d'Allemagne dans l'ancienne Université de Paris*, No. 26, 1613-1660. Bibliothèque de l'Université, Paris.

[2] *Registre de la nation d'Allemagne dans l'ancienne Université de Paris.* No. 26. 1613-1660.

the Royal Charter and Statutes sanctioned by the University required that priests from all parts of Ireland should be admitted. Messingham replied that, in respect to his own administration, he had never diverged from the statutes.[1] All this O'Molony has personally recorded in the minutes of the German Nation, 1625.[2]

Had O'Molony no ties with Ireland, he might have remained in the Continental mission. His sister (Margaret) had married,[3] his brother (Thomas) was comparatively well off, and so, without doing violence to his sense of family duty, he could have remained abroad, to enjoy the promising career which had just opened up for him. But, on the other hand, he was the owner of extensive estates in different parts of Thomond,[4] and probably this consideration joined with the more powerful one of being once more amongst his own people and of preaching the gospel to them, determined him, in the teeth of his friends' opposition, to return home. This was about the end of 1625. His friends now declared that, as he had decided to return to Ireland, they would get him made bishop of his native diocese, Killaloe.

From 1616 the diocese of Killaloe had been ruled by Vicars Apostolic, and the first suggestion for a new bishop came about 1624.[5] Malachy O'Queely was the rival candidate. He had been a fellow student of O'Molony's in the University, and like him he had held a chair of philosophy (in the College of Navarre).[6] They were both

---

[1] *Registre de la nation d'Allemagne dans l'ancienne Université de Paris.* No. 26. 1613-1660. The former Superior had been Dr. Dease, a native of Meath, and considering the strength of "Provincialism" at all times in our history, it is likely enough that the charge of the Rector was well founded.

[2] It is noticeable that O'Molony in his first procuratorship (1620) writes O'Molony with one l, and after with a double ll—O'Mollony. I have adopted the first spelling as the most uniform and nearest the original Irish. The change may be accounted for by the presence of an Irishman in Paris, named O'Moloy, about 1625. O'Moloy's name frequently occurs in the records, and possibly was being confused with O'Molony.

[3] *Propugnaculum Catholicae Veritatis.* [4] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

[5] Brady. *Episcopal Succession in Ireland.* (Killaloe). [6] *Irish College,* p. 20.

from the diocese of Killaloe, and in every qualification they were signally endowed for the position. In 1622 Malachy O'Queely had been named Vicar Apostolic of Killaloe, with perhaps a tacit understanding that he would be shortly promoted to the episcopal rank.[1] Accordingly he set out for Ireland, and in 1624 it was suggested to the Holy See that he should be made Bishop of Killaloe. At exactly the same period O'Molony's friends requested the bishopric for him. Soon the competition grew animated, and the Holy See was deluged with recommendations from both sides. In Ireland O'Queely was more universally supported than O'Molony. On August 17, 1624, some eminent persons of Thomond petitioned Rome on behalf of O'Molony. O'Queely countered by a still more imposing petition, signed by the chief nobles of Thomond, amongst whom we notice the name of O'Brien, the father of Murrough of the Burnings. After this we hear no more of O'Molony; but O'Queely's friends stormed the Holy See again and again with recommendations, written in terms of the most unstinted admiration. Bishops and provincials of religious orders in Ireland addressed collective or individual letters in his favour.[2] The chapter of the diocese unanimously advised his appointment. All ecclesiastical Ireland in a word desired and requested the appointment of Malachy O'Queely. But meanwhile O'Molony's friends had been using more secret and penetrative means. And a correspondent warned O'Queely in 1626 that, unless he wished to lose the See of Killaloe, he had better bring more pressure to bear on the Roman authorities.[3] Accordingly in 1629 the Earl of Tyrone (O'Neill), whose influence at Rome was great, urged the appointment of O'Queely. But it was all to no effect.[4] The Queen Mother had written to the

[1] *Historical MSS. Commision Franciscan MSS.* p. 76.
[2] *Historical MSS. Commission. Franciscan MSS.* Pp. 8.11.26
[3] *Ibid.* [4] Meehan: *Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 102. (Appendix).

French ambassador at Rome directing him to secure the See of Killaloe for O'Molony, and the Queen Mother was then all powerful at the Roman Court. At last in 1630 Urban VIII. appointed John O'Molony Bishop of Killaloe.[1]

In November, 1630, O'Molony was consecrated in Paris by the Bishop of Auxerre, assisted by two other bishops.[2] A few months later, having put his Paris affairs in order, he set out for Ireland, and by the spring of 1631 was quietly at work in his native diocese of Killaloe. From the start his authority was resented by those who had expected O'Queely would be their bishop, and the more dissolute took advantage of his unpopularity to repudiate his authority and lead unworthy lives. In many cases he was stubbornly opposed by his own priests, some of whom went so far as to advocate the marriage of the clergy.[3] Twenty years without a bishop had brought the diocese to a sad state of neglect. But O'Molony was not to be trifled with, and after three years he had overcome the more serious of his difficulties.

His enemies, however, were not yet silenced. They carried their charges to Rome, where they accused him of wasting his own and his people's money in all kinds of uncanonical enterprises. One charge was that he had employed ecclesiastical revenues in the upkeep of a princely retinue and of a luxurious household—*de me conqueruntur in attribuendo mihi magnam equorum, equitum et peditum catervam.*[4] It was even hinted that this house-

---

[1] O'Queely was almost immediately recompensed for the loss of Killaloe by his appointment to the higher episcopal rank of Tuam. The rivals did not lose their temper in the contest, and there is no reason to believe that their friendship was in any way diminished. O'Queely proved a man of great courage and ability in the Confederate wars. His opinions in council were deeply valued, nor did he in emergency disdain to use the sword himself. "If other things fail," he said, when the outlook was blackest for the Confederation, "I can have a soldier's pay." He was the mainstay of the Confederation in Connaught until he was hacked to pieces on the field of battle in October, 1645.

[2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

[3] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

[4] *Spicilegium Ossorieuse*, vol. 1, p. 201.

hold was not what it ought to be from the point of view of morals—that women were constantly visiting it. Calumnies poured into Rome with deadly persistency, and on the principle that it is a difficult matter to overtake a lie.

Rome, however, took up the cause of O'Molony, and in the correspondence that ensued he had no trouble in clearing his reputation of these charges. The only feminine visitor to his house was his sister, Margaret, who was married to Moilin Mac Brody. No other woman crossed his threshold. And with regard to his "luxurious household," these are the simple facts. When O'Molony took over the charge of his diocese there was no residence either for the bishop or for the cathedral clergy.[1] Having large private means, he was soon able to remedy this want; but the residence which he established for himself and his clergy had the character of a monastery rather than of a home. It was subject to a strict rule of life, and reminds one of those cathedral communities which the Germans had organised, during the Investiture quarrel, for the purpose of creating a high standard of morality and to protect the celibacy of the clergy. With some such motive in his mind O'Molony wished to have his priests living with him. As already stated, there were no women in his household. The hours were regular; half of the day was allotted to spiritual work, the other half was used as each one desired. O'Molony, according to Lynch, gave the most edifying example. Notwithstanding the fact that he was now past fifty years of age, he practised the most extreme austerities. He fasted for days even though he was a chronic invalid, and would remain on his knees in prayer for hours. He was a typical

1 "The Catholic clergy had no fixed income or regular supply of alms, nor any fixed domiciles to reside in, either as communities or singly. They went from house to house among the faithful, from whom they received frugal and scanty fare, and occasionally presents of money." Report on the state of Ireland sent (May 3, 1632) to the Propaganda by the Archbishop of Cashel.—See Brady's *Episcopal Succession*, p. 23.

priest of medieval times—stern, ascetic, terrible to the enemies of his church, inflexible in the hour of trial. He preached constantly up and down the diocese, and his favourite theme was the efficacy of the Rosary. He also held frequent synods, in which the canons of the church, the discipline of the clergy, and the general affairs of the diocese were discussed.

When such a bishop comes into a lax community and proceeds to reform it, he naturally meets with opposition. I have already given some account of this opposition and of its apparent defeat at the hands of O'Molony. However, he seems only to have scotched it; for it raised its head again about 1635, and this time succeeded in poisoning the ears of Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Cashel. Dr. Walsh, as we know, was one of the chief supporters of O'Queely for the See of Killaloe, and on the defeat of his candidate may have entertained some resentment against O'Molony. At any rate both bishops, to the serious detriment of their dioceses, were at loggerheads for the next four years. But in 1639 Rome stepped in and determined to bring the dispute to an end. The Bishop of Ossory was appointed arbitrator, and he does not seem to have experienced much difficulty in effecting a reconcilation between the two bishops. O'Molony had been obviously calumniated, and as soon as Dr. Walsh was brought to see that, they embraced one another and remained ever afterwards close friends.[1]

Two years of successful and easy administration in the diocese of Killaloe went by. All over Ireland there brooded an atmosphere of strange and unusual tranquillity; but something ominous in the temper of the people, a faint stirring of conspiracy and vague rumours of upheaval portended that a mighty storm was at hand. In the spring of 1642 O'Molony left his diocese and travelled to the monastery of Kenalehan, which was hidden away in a lonely glen of the Slieve Aughty hills on the

[1] *Spicilegium Ossoriense.* Vol. I., p. 235.

borders of County Clare.[1] Thither John De Burgo, a member of the Clanrickard family and newly appointed Bishop of Clonfert, had come to be consecrated. Malachy O'Queely was to officiate, and O'Molony was to act as assistant. They were now the best of friends. The ceremony took place on May 19, 1642, and when the sun went down, the hills all around were ablaze with bonfires, lit in honour of the new bishop. Next day the bishops dispersed to their dioceses. Five months went by, and the hills were ablaze again. The battle thunder had broken suddenly, and the Irish people once more faced the conqueror.

What were the chances of success? An adequate answer to this question would necessitate a long digression into the constituent elements of Irish civilisation. I shall confine myself to a brief survey of the century preceding the Confederation of Kilkenny. Irish civilisation, though the spontaneous growth of a loosely organised state which had no central government, was able to weather many a storm and to absorb many a foreign element. Then came Henry VIII with a new plan of conquest. This monarch has the credit of being the first English ruler to see the great advantages of conquest by colonisation. He is the creator of the policy of taking the land from the Irish and of holding the country by compact English settlements; and the miracle is that the Irish nation is still in existence to-day.

The colonisation policy, inaugurated by Henry VIII, was ruthlessly pursued by his successors; but it cannot be said to have struck lasting roots before the Flight of the Earls in 1607. This momentous event was the first great and irretrievable disaster; in the years that followed the English conquest made unprecedented strides. By the year 1642 all or nearly all the notable Irish soldiers had been killed or driven into exile, the landowners had been dispossessed over large areas, the population reduced

[1] Meehan: *Franciscan Monasteries*, p. 74.

by half, and the tribal organisation, in its larger bearings, crushed out of all recognition. If the movement of conquest was to be arrested, there was not a moment to lose. At this turning point in Irish history the church was the most centralised and most representative body in the nation. To the church the people instinctively looked for leadership, and to this appeal the church almost instantly responded. The bishops summoned a national synod, which was held at Kilkenny on May 10, 1642. The result of the deliberations between them and the laity was the association known in history as the Confederation of Kilkenny—the most decisive step the nation had yet taken.

Returning to the subject of this sketch, we shall find that O'Molony always followed the main stream of the ecclesiastical policy, and since the ecclesiastical policy is the key of the whole movement, his part (however minor it may appear) is of importance. Sometimes it so happens that a great epoch in a nation's life is without a central figure or commanding personality, who sums up its inner meaning and delivers its message. Such was the Confederation. Great soldiers, like Owen Roe, there were. But where can we discover the man who expresses the period to our satisfaction, as Tyrconnell does in 1689, or Wolfe Tone in 1800 ? Of the period, therefore, almost more than of any other period, it may be said that it is made up of lesser men, whose action, however commonplace and uninspiring, deserves to be studied. And this is partially my excuse for introducing a sketch of O'Molony. In May, 1643, he was in attendance at the bishops' conclave in the course of which it was decided to unify the national effort by means of a central council. These decisions were incorporated in decrees, and one of the signatories to them was O'Molony.[1]

Lynch in his biographical notes pays a warm tribute to the generosity of O'Molony all during these years.[2]

[1] Spicilegium Ossoriense. Vol. I., p. 262. [2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

He had liberally supported the confederate soldiers in his own house and at his own expense. He had contributed with even greater lavishness to the national war chest. The bishop was constantly on horseback, throwing himself with untiring energy into the complexities which multiply so rapidly in a semi-organised state suddenly called on to make war. Under the great strain his health broke down; but Dr. Arthur, a Limerick physician, was summoned to his bedside and soon cured him of a gangrene. The doctor tells us that he got £1 for his trouble. He waxes very sarcastic at O'Molony's expense, and amongst other things calls him "an economical and thrifty man." Finally he vented his feelings in a lampoon of appalling quality.[1]

By 1645 the emissaries of the Confederation had applied for assistance at the majority of the European courts. The Papacy in particular had been impressed by the fine fighting of the Irish, and for religious and political reasons decided to inspire them to greater efforts by the despatch of money and an ambassador. The ecclesiastical party must have experienced great satisfaction at the news that John Baptist Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, would be soon amongst them and that Rome would publicly bless the Confederate cause. Rinuccini was an Italian and eminently skilled in canon law. Besides, his training had been in the Italy of Machiavelli and Cæsar Borgia, and consequently he was not likely to be duped by Ormond or his section. Though it is now the fashion to belittle him and accuse him of vanity and fanaticism, yet he would seem to have had qualities of insight and determination of the highest order, and to have penetrated from the first through the veil that screened the Ormond faction. He saw that the middle party was the great danger, that they wished to tempt the nation into inactivity on the strength of a peace which, to say the least of it, was vague and uncertain.

[1] Lenihan: *History of Limerick*, pp. 162 and 168

The crux was how far the Irish would support him. Would they undermine his position by negotiating with the parties of left or right ?

Already Glamorgan had reached Kilkenny, and had settled the terms of peace. On the instant Rinuccini grappled with the clique of the General Assembly who would make terms with Ormond provided that " mere toleration " was extended to the Catholics. He openly condemned the terms proposed by Ormond all through 1646, and a month before the peace was declared announced his policy to the Supreme Council in the clearest and most unmistakable manner. He formally protested against any dealings with Ormond under the present circumstances, and went on to outline a policy that excelled in vigour and directness any that had been yet proposed. Let them claim their rights as Catholics and Irishmen in the fullest measure, and, if necessary (he hinted), they could look about for a foreign alliance. A month later the peace was concluded, and the Nuncio had recourse to more drastic measures. He felt that he could depend on the clergy and on the Ulster army under Owen Roe O'Neill. The priests had absolute ascendancy over the minds of the people, and the Ulster army was by far the best military weapon then in Ireland. With two such formidable allies Rinuccini could have faced the future with confidence. But events soon showed that the clergy were not so unanimously in his favour; for in the hour of trial a number of the bishops passed over to the side of Ormond. The Ulster soldiers, however, and their leader never faltered in allegiance to the Nuncio.

From the 6th to 12th of August, 1646, ten bishops and several inferior ecclesiastics sat at Waterford and deliberated on the " Ormond " peace. Finally they issued a manifesto to the people of Ireland in which all were declared " perjured " who would adhere to the thirty articles of peace, and all were excommunicated who had

brought it about. John O'Molony was one of the prelates in attendance, and he signed the decrees that were published.[1] The victory for the Ulster arms at Benburb decided the dispute in the Nuncio's favour; but all through the year 1647 the Confederate armies were singularly unlucky in the field, and in the spring of 1648, when a cessation was again offered, not only did the luke-warm nobility welcome it but even a section of the clergy. Signs of great strain now appeared in the clerical party, and in the April of 1648 events had reached a climax. The Supreme Council voted in favour of the cessation, and slowly the splendid structure of ecclesiastical unity, which more than anything else had struck terror into the enemy, swayed over and crashed to the ground. The majority of the clerical party, amongst whom was O'Molony, followed Rinuccini; but the rest, headed by John De Burgo, Archbishop of Tuam, seceded and joined the "Ormondites." The Nuncio directed his steps to Maryborough where the Ulster army under Owen Roe lay encamped, and from this refuge prepared to deliver a counterstroke. A general excommunication was launched against all those who had "abetted the truce with Inchiquin." Copies of the decree were forwarded to the more eminent of the clergy; a copy was sent to O'Molony instructing him to enforce it.[2] For a moment it looked as if the Nuncio would carry the day; but the opposing bishops denied his jurisdiction and appealed to Rome.

This was the signal for an outburst of all the disruptive forces against the Nuncio. Everything which had tended to enfeeble the national effort since its inception crept out of the dark places into broad daylight and struck at him. The Ormondists especially thrived with the new turn of events. Ormond now found himself at the

---

[1] Coxe: *History of Ireland*, p. 122 (Appendix); Carte: *Life of Ormond*. Vol. III. Book IV., p. 253.

[2] *Hibernia Dominicana*. (Supplementum), p. 895.

head of a semi-national party, whose ostensible object of attack was the Nuncio, but whose real end was the dissolution of the Confederation. With that accomplished, he hoped to patch up a peace with the Commonwealth. In the field of Irish national affairs there remained but two figures who could inspire confidence and who could, if properly supported, convert disaster into triumph. One was Owen Roe O'Neill, but provincial jealousy barred his progress to supreme power. The other was the Nuncio, but he had already been checkmated and thrown aside, and as the year drew to a close, he resigned all effort and waited in Galway for fair winds to blow him back to Italy.

The great burden of the resistance now devolved on those bishops who had remained loyal to the Nuncio and on the Ulster army. Heber Mac Mahon, Bishop of Clogher, took charge of affairs in Ulster, and O'Molony and the Bishop of Ferns in Connaught.[1] During the year 1649 the country was deprived of its great military champion, Owen Roe, by the poison of the assassin. He had been driven to consider proposals from Sir Charles Coote by the want of food and ammunition. Without both no army can continue to exist. But with the coming of Cromwell and the fall of Wicklow and Wexford the nation was rudely awakened to a sense of the danger which threatened its existence. The horror of Cromwell's deeds and the stern logic of events compelled a union between the warring Irish parties. Many of Ormond's supporters passed over to the extreme Irish party, or rather to what was left of the Nuncioists, and a period of considerable activity ensued. But it was too late. Cromwell, a man of giant energy, had entered through the breach which Ormond had made, and with sombre and unspeakable deeds he demolished Irish resistance. In the last years O'Molony was prominent; like most

[1] *Spicilegium Ossoriense.* Vol. I., p. 372.

of the bishops he concentrated on the destruction of Ormond. He was the cause of all their misfortunes, and even yet he was a demoralising influence in the effort against Cromwell. It was a heroic attempt to retrieve a situation that was irretrievable.

At a time when Cromwell was virtually master of the country and Ormond, with the mischief done, thinking of flight, the Irish clergy met at Clonmacnoise (Dec. 4, 1649). Heber Mac Mahon, Bishop of Clogher and commander of the Ulster army, reviewed the situation. He emphasised the prime necessity of sinking all differences in order to present a common front to the enemy, and he got the Assembly to express their detestation of all "animosities between the old Irish and English, or Scotch royalists, and their resolution of punishing all the clergy that should be found to encourage them."[1] It was found expedient not to publicly denounce Ormond just then. Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, and O'Molony were the chief clerical representatives from Connaught, and they signed all the decrees.[2]

In the spring of 1649 the articles of peace between Ormond and the Confederates had been ratified by Charles II.[3]; but after the Irish disasters at Drogheda and Wexford all concessions made in favour of Catholics were recalled, and the peace declared null and void. This was done, people understood, on the advice of Ormond. At last the double-dealing of Charles II. and his Lord Lieutenant had come to light, and the nation as a whole saw how it had been duped, and how it had misplaced its trust. Charles II. had never any conscience to lose, and when it was a question between his honour and his convenience he never hesitated in giving the

[1] Carte: *Life of Ormond.* Vol. III. Book V., p. 519.

[2] Dwyer: *Diocese of Killaloe*, p. 270.

[3] After the execution of Charles I. on January 30, 1649, Ormond had the Prince of Wales proclaimed King, under the title of Charles II., in every town in Ireland that owned allegiance to him. His own powers as Lord Lieutenant were confirmed by the new King on February 17th.

[4] Carte: *Life of Ormond.* Vol. III. Book V., p. 545-546.

preference to the latter. Ormond, however, did not leave the field readily. He made an attempt to lull the suspicions of the Irish now in control, and particularly of the bishops. They, on the other hand, believed the hour for more decisive methods had struck, that now was the time for making an end of Ormond's influence, which had been so uniformly destructive in Irish affairs.

The next few moves on both sides were in the nature of scouting. Ormond invited the bishops to a conference near Limerick, and then asked them to procure him a passport into the city. They were very courteous, but did not offer to assist him, and when Ormond took on a more quarrelsome attitude they firmly requested him to remove all the "English out of the army and kingdom[4]" as the most effective means of curing the jealousy which the nation had entertained of them and of Ormond on their account. This piece of irony the Duke accepted with admirable self-restraint, and they parted, the Duke to invent new tricks of diplomacy and the clergy to deliberate at Loughrea, where they took up their new headquarters. Immediately afterwards Ormond discovered that the object of their journey had been to create a misunderstanding between himself and Inchiquin, then "to get rid of both and make themselves absolute masters of the kingdom.[1]"

It is remarkable how the trend of events had clarified the "ecclesiastical policy." Once the bishops had come to know that Ormond was a dishonourable tool of a more dishonourable master, automatically they had reverted to the basis of policy which the Nuncio had laid down, and which was, unless England restores to Ireland the full measure of civil and religious rights, to seek a foreign alliance and make English occupation impossible. The next step was to publish Ormond's infamy to the world, and for this purpose they assembled at Jamestown on August 6, 1650. After some days' deliberation, Dr.

[1] Carte: *Life of Ormond.* Vol. III. Book V., pp. 545, 546.

Kelly, Bishop of Dromore, was sent to Ormond with the order "that he should speedily quit the kingdom.[1]" Also, under pain of excommunication, Catholics were forbidden to recognise his authority. Finally, the bishops came to the conclusion that foreign assistance was absolutely necessary, and so on the 11th of the same month six commissioners were elected to treat with the Duke of Lorraine for the despatch of his troops into Ireland. John O'Molony subscribed to all these decrees.[2] The bishops had come at last to agree on the essentials of the national policy, which differed not a hair's breadth from those of Rinuccini; but the magical opportunity had passed. Had they only Ormond to deal with even at the eleventh hour, victory could still have been snatched from defeat; but with Cromwell at hand all possibilities of success seemed to take flight.

The best the Irish could hope for was to hold out until foreign assistance had arrived. Limerick and Galway were the towns most easily defended. To supply these with garrisons was the first need, and for this purpose the Assembly at Jamestown decided to mobilise an army. They appointed a committee, and issued commissions for the levying of soldiers.[3] It is likely that O'Molony was a member of this committee. The character of his subsequent activities lend support to such an assumption. He was deputed with the important work of destroying Ormond, who at the moment had taken up his headquarters in Clare. To accomplish this very difficult task he had as yet only a few swords. He set out, therefore, for Clare with full authority to collect forces, called on his relations and friends, and they appointed Quin (Co. Clare) as the rendezvous for the muster. In the meanwhile Ormond had been informed of the bishop's movements. A little scouting showed that he was practically undefended, and when O'Molony rode into

[1] Carte: *Life of Ormond.* Vol. III. Book V., p. 560.
[2] *Hibernia Dominicana,* pp. 691, 692.
[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 564-565.

Quin he was surprised and taken by Wogan, Ormond's colonel of horse. Wogan, according to Carte, would have put O'Molony to death if the Duke of Ormond had not saved him. The colonel searched the bishop's baggage, and wrapped up in woolsacks he found the sum of £1,400 in solid gold—intended to pay the recruits.[1] O'Molony and his treasure were then handed over to Ormond; but after a short detention he was set at liberty, and a small part of the treasure returned to him.

From Clare O'Molony travelled to Limerick through a country swarming with cut-throats and deserters from all the parties. He managed to reach the city and find refuge there without molestation. Limerick was now the centre of national resistance. From all sides friends and enemies were converging on the city. The Irish determined that this citadel of the race, the last support of the Confederation, should not lightly be surrendered. It was the final episode in the war. Politically speaking, the issue could hardly alter the decisive character of the defeat which the Confederation had suffered. At best it could protract the Cromwellian day of reckoning only for a little. Still so long as Limerick remained untaken the Confederation, wounded and war-worn as it was, held in one hand the sword, and from this city could sally out again to harass the enemy. These were primarily some of the thoughts that decided the prelates at Loughrea to send Archbishop Walsh, Bishops Dwyer, O'Brien and O'Molony to the city of Limerick. They were to preach resistance to the enemy and loyalty to the nation.[2]

Hardly were they inside the gates when the army of Ireton marched into sight, and gradually the city was invested from all sides. Within all was confusion. From

[1] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae*; *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, p. 367; Bellesheim, p. 501.

[2] O'Molony, in a letter about this date to the Holy See, described the state of Ireland thus: "Res Catholicorum et regni Hiberniae pessime a memorato tempore successit, adeo ut tribus gladiis seu flagellis incessanter percutimur, quippe bello, fame et peste." (*Spicilegium Ossoriense*, p. 355).

the first starvation stared the defenders in the face, the plague soon broke out, and vague rumours of treachery went round from house to house. Taken all in all the city was badly fitted to endure a long siege. And if it did, it was largely due to the heroic spirit of the soldiers and the inspiring example of the leaders, among whom we may specially count the prelates. Almost alone they preserved a fearless and confident attitude. Even Ireton found out that they were the mainstay of the whole resistance. If they should withdraw, he believed that demoralisation would seize the defenders and that the city would be his. He actually offered some of the bishops bribes of money, and promised them every protection if they would put the city into his hands.[1]

These proposals they rejected with scorn. The siege dragged on for six months, and depression daily deepened within the city. People were dying like flies from the plague. There was general uneasiness that some night the gates would be thrown open to Ireton by traitors and that they all would be butchered in their beds. To crown their misfortunes the treasury was exhausted and the soldiers had to go without pay.

For these six months O'Molony had taken a leading part. He had helped to nurse the plague-stricken, and had encouraged the soldiers. Lynch tells us that he took great pains to trace and ransom the sacred vessels which in the confusion of the times had gone astray or had been stolen by Cromwellian soldiers; and that further, as the siege drew to a close, he had personally maintained the whole garrison for a fortnight, paying the soldiers out of his own purse. In this way he had become a marked man in the eyes of the enemy.[2] The bishops had prolonged the resistance because they believed there was a possibility of help from the Duke of Lorraine; but when this passed away on the inevitable road of

[1] Bellesheim. Vol. II., p. 500

[2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

national disappointments, they abandoned their uncompromising attitude and advised the defenders to make the best terms they could.

In consequence negotiations were opened with Ireton in the autumn of 1651. The citizens secured comparatively good terms; but on one point Ireton would not yield an inch—Bishops O'Dwyer, O'Brien, O'Molony and Walsh must be exempted from pardon. Nothing could alter his resolution. This, he said, would be a prime condition of peace.[1] The citizens had to make the best of it and sacrifice their bishops. And the terms of surrender were signed. The same day O'Molony, who had been attending the plague-stricken, caught the disease and died. His illness was short and merciful in its swiftness. He was buried somewhere in the city without ceremony and apparently in haste, for to-day there is no trace of his grave.[2] People were too agitated about their own fate to pay much heed to the death of even one who had been conspicuous for unselfish and ceaseless sacrifice.

On the 27th October (1651) the Cromwellian troops marched into the city, and for three days the inhabitants were at the mercy of undisciplined soldiery, who looted and murdered as they pleased. However, O'Molony's fellow bishops did not fare too badly on the whole. O'Dwyer, disguised as a peasant, his face smeared with gunpowder, marched off among the Irish soldiers. Walsh effected his escape in an equally resourceful manner. O'Brien, Bishop of Emly, alone was captured. He was tried by courtmartial and executed. He warned Ireton on the eve of his death that God would take signal vengeance on his murderers; a month later Ireton died raving wildly of this prophecy. Death had almost certainly saved O'Molony from sharing the fate of O'Brien; for O'Molony was an invalid and would surely

[1] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae; Spicilegium Ossoriense.* Vol. I., p. 386.
[2] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.*

have been taken. However, says his famous contemporary (Lynch), " he cannot be denied a martyr's death.[1] "

Bishop O'Molony was in his seventies at death. His life had come within a period of all-important national activity. From his actions and letters we can discover the breadth and firmness of his character. From his intimacy with the Nuncio,[2] and from his clear grasp of political realities, it is evident that he was gifted with no small amount of insight and shrewdness. I have given this rapid sketch of his life (1) because it throws light on the more remarkable career of his nephew and namesake, John O'Molony, and (2) because it reveals the gradual growth of that extreme Irish policy which was first defined by Rinuccini and was later taken up by the ecclesiastical party. I feel further fortified, because O'Molony's nephew (as I hope to show in future articles) will prove one of the ablest exponents of that policy in the next half of the 17th century. The more cruelly England oppressed the Irish, the more they were driven to have recourse to extreme measures and to seek help from some great Continental Power. In the days of Hugh O'Neill that Power was Spain; in the days of Bishop O'Molony II. it was France.[3]

JAMES HOGAN.

---

[1] *De Praesulibus Hiberniae.* The Cromwellians revenged themselves by looting the house of the dead bishop, and by burning his books and papers.

[2] The Nuncio wrote personally to him. (See H.M.C. Report 7, 408 B).

[3] During the lifetime of O'Molony I. various attempts were made to enlist the services of France in the cause of Irish freedom; but France was then too occupied with European enemies. One of these was the Duke of Lorraine. In order to find an outlet for the restless ambition of this ruler, French ministers suggested him to the Irish agents of 1650 as a possible Protector. Accordingly he was approached, and a promise of military aid under certain conditions was obtained. But the fall of Limerick sealed the fate of the projected alliance and of Irish freedom for many a day. It is interesting to note that the Irish agent who exercised the greatest influence over the Duke of Lorraine was Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns, an intimate friend of O'Molony I. (See Warner's *History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland*, p. 532.)

DETACHMENT.

OH for a spirit steadfast, unsubdued
To wordly villeinage, a bosom clean
Of earth's base uses, and a will serene
In sovereign strength of its own hardihood,
That so I might unto my proper good
Be constant ever, and with purpose keen
Move in calm mastery through this troubled scene,
Monarch of self in full imperial mood!
Then should my soul, like some sea-shattering rock
Rising aloof from the low trodden shore,
Stand in bare grandeur 'gainst the 'whelming shock
Of the world's powers and deaf to their proud roar;
Or peaklike mount to some far virgin height
Where not ev'n eagle wing should hazard flight.

JOHN BUNKER.

VIATICUM.

(After the French of Eugène Manuel).

IF you would sing, with faith you must begin,
Faith in the Maker of a world of song,
Who lights the souls that in His flame grow strong,
Making the humblest to the stars akin:
If you would sing, with faith you must begin.

If you would fight, with faith you must begin;
Wrestling for justice, not a game with dice:
For faith is duty, faith is sacrifice,
And you must smite the foe as he were sin:
If you would fight, with faith you must begin.

If you would love, with faith you must begin,
Faith in a love immortal, infinite,
Showering its gifts till earth is manna-white,
Waiting the Heaven Death shall usher in:
If you would love, with faith you must begin.

GEORGE NOBLE PLUNKETT

FROM THE HILLS.

TO-DAY the hills seemed strangely still, all day
The pines on Cruagh slept; but, evening falling,
A little timid wind crept from the grey
Above Glencree, and calling, calling, calling
Across old sheep-tracks in the untrodden heights,
Dropt through a deepening-coloured dusk at last,
Purple to green, down darkling roads to lights
Set in white cottage window-sills, and passed.

Wind from the hills! it's little peace you bring
Out of that quiet distance: memories
Wakened in far-off woods at evening,
Where, strewn by older autumns, 'neath still trees,
The very leaves were all lost days, it seemed,
Brushing about the head of one who dreamed!

W. M. Gibbon.

SADB.

YOU have escaped from death: tis we dwell blinded
Under death's shadow, perplexed and phantom-driven.
You whom the Finger of Life has touched have awakened
Out of the prisoned dream to the Being of God.
O lover of beauty, your unsealed eyes are beholding
The Light that casts as a shadow the beauty of earth:
O lover of life, from the Fountain of Life you are drinking!
In that new world upon strange new labours speed,
Faithful as ever, your hands outstretched to our weakness.
What wonders dawn on your spirit, what powers unveiled!
O eager heart, so swift unto all adventure,
Search out, joy-winged, ways hidden and paths untrod.

Moirin a Cheavasa.
(Moireen Fox).

THE KING OF EMAIN.

"The king of Emain was forbidden to listen to the singing of the birds of Lough Swilly."—Joyce's *Social History of Ancient Ireland*, p. 311.

HE sees with more than mortal eye,
And hears with more than mortal ear;
A seventh son of a seventh son,
With a blessed seventh sense beside;
He can see, he can hear
The voices of birds on the south wind
And the voices of birds on the west,
Where the rainbow hues of the mountains
Are lying on Swilly's breast.

He sees with more than mortal eye
Colour bloom like an opening rose,
Open the petals and shew the heart
Inward enshrined loveliness.
Yes, he hears and he sees
The purple of glens on the east wind,
The gold of dawn from each magic throat,
The blue of the skies on the north wind,
Years pass in a single note.

The king hath forgotten his throne
For melodied light on the hills,
And the jewelled song of the birds,
The Heaven of beautiful things
He hath heard, he hath seen.
The King hath forgotten Emania
For the trees and the inland tide
And splendour that calls from the four winds
When the gates of the soul are wide.

LOLA STEELE-NICHOLSON.

UNPUBLISHED IRISH POEMS.

IX.—On a Blind Harper.—II.

EDITED BY PROFESSOR OSBORN BERGIN, PH.D.

THE author and date of the following poem are unknown. Its subject is the same harper, Nioclás Dall, to whom Fear Flatha O Gnímh addressed the poem in the last number of STUDIES. Nicholas Dall, of Rattoo, harper, was pardoned on the 11th April, 1601 (Fiants Eliz. n°. 6494). O'Curry, Manners and Customs iii. 262, quotes from a Kerry MS.—"As to the harp, said county could well bragg, having the chiefest master of that instrument in his time, Mr. Nicholas Pierce of Clonmaurice, not only for his singular capacity of composing lamentations, funerals, additions and elevations, etc., but also by completing said instrument with more wires than ever before his time were used." I owe these references to Professor T. F. O'Rahilly.

It is to be regretted that while family pride has preserved reams of encomiastic verse, many beautiful lyrics have been lost, or handed down by accident in a fragmentary state. The text of this remarkable poem is very uncertain. There are three 19th century copies in the Royal Irish Academy. Two of them, E.V. 5 (E) and 23 G 20 (G), run to twenty-two quatrains, omitting §§ 7, 11 and 14 below; the third 23 N 13 (N) is only a confused fragment. The text of all three is exceedingly bad. I give the text of The O'Conor Don's Book (C), with a few readings from the late copies. In this MS. the opening words of the first three quatrains have been torn away.

OSBORN BERGIN.

1. Tiar táinig tús na seanma;
gnáth dúil a ndiaigh oileamhna;
críoch Mhumhan na séadmhúr sídh
bunadh na ccéadghlún cciníl.

2. Cá beag d'fhiadhnaise air[1] sin
imreasuin dá mhac Mílidh,
ag roinn fhóid bhláthchoille Breagh
don dámhchoinne[2] óig fhéinneadh.

---

[1] ar C.

[2] dámhchoille C, dáinh chaoin (choíng) EG.

3. Tugsad go hEirinn eidir
fhilidh agus oirfididh,[1]
a slios Tuir bhratghloin Bhreoghain,[2]
tar muir n-atmhair n-ainbhtheanaigh.[3]

4. Onaoi dob ainm don fhior chiúil,
Cior mac Cis ceann ar seiniúil;
ní leanfam dá slonnadh sin,
dá ollamh mearchlann Mílidh.

5. Ordaighis Eibhear[4] amhra
crannchor fa a n-aos[5] ealadhna
ar mbeith d'Eireamhón ón fhior
ar leith gléimheadhón Gaoidheal.

6. Do thaoibh Eibhir[6]—gárbh fhearr céim ?
tarla[7] an t-oirfideach ainnséin :
re gnúis mbuig ngeilmhíolla ngloin
fa neimhdhíogha an cuid crannchoir.

7. Ríoghdhacht na seanma ó so lat
ag leanmhuin luirg na ríomhac :
atá ag seinshliocht Eibhir[8] Fhinn
eighriocht re a n-eirigh inntinn.

8. Dá mbeith fós nach raibh reimhe,
atá an uairsi dh'áiridhe
fréamh an cheóil a muigh Mhumhan,
sgeóil ar a bhfuil fíadhnughadh.

9. Atá aniugh ag Nioclás Dall,
ar cheart ar chumas n-adhbhann,[9]
mír curadh cheóil na Banbha,
bunadh eóil na healadhna.

---

[1] -igh CE. [2] mbratghloin mbeoghain C. [3] natfoir nanfhannoigh C.
[4] Eim*hear* C. [5] anaois C. [6] Eimhir C. [7] do bhí C, tarl*aidh cet.*
[8] Eimhir C. [9] nemhonn C, chúmadh (chuma) snadhmann EG.

10. Cumadóir na ccleas ndoilbhthe,[1]
gaduidhe na geamhoidhche,
musgladh brón[2] baoithchridhe[3] ban,
glóir[4] nach saoilfidhe[5] a síothbhrugh.

11. Adhbhar caomhnaidhe cumhadh,
sás meanman do mhórughadh,
siansa[6] ón girre laoi[7] leabhra,
nach binne caoi[8] Céideamhna.

12. Colloid ré caoine a sheanma
na beathadhaigh bhrúideamhla,
ag éisdeacht mharbhchor a mhér mbras,[9]
do anfadh én[10] re a amas.[11]

13. Líonmhaire 'ná an fér ag fás
ar leath ó lámhuibh Nioclás,[12]
sreatha a ghéag[13] cceathbhraonach[14] cciúin
do ghealchaolach téad[15] ttaighiúir.

14. Mar dheibh a ndiaigh a rionnta,[16]
ní fios d'aos[17] aigeanta,
séis marbhghlan a mheóir rathmhair[18]
d'adhnadh[19] an cheóil chuimhrighthi.[20]

Tiar.

---

[1] *sic* EGN, dóilche C. [2] *sic* EGN, bróin C.
[3] biothchroidhe C baoth croidhe *etc. cet.*
[4] glóir C, ceol *cet.* [5] síolfoidhe *etc.* MSS. [6] sians C.
[7] laoithe C. [8] caoithe C. [9] imheoir bhrais C [10] eóin MSS.
[11] re anamais C. [12] niocaláis C. [13] sreth ageg C, sreatha séad EG.
[14] sic G, cciothbráonach C. [15] ttéd C. [16] rannta C.
[17] daois C. A syllable is wanting. Read nach d'aos (?).
[18] Rime missing. [19] dámhnadh C. [20] chuimhighthi C.

Translation.

1. In the west came the beginning of music : each creature is wont to follow its nurture : Munster's land of rich peaceful dwellings is the stock of the first generations.
2. Witness enough thereof is the strife of Míl's two sons, when the young band of champions were sharing the smooth-wooded soil of Brega.
3. They brought, at all events, to Ireland a poet and a musician from beside Breogan's Tower [1] of fair mantles, over the swelling stormy sea.
4. Onaoi was the minstrel's name. Cior son of Cis was the head of our ancient lore : we shall no further name these two ollavs of Míl's blithe Children.
5. Famous Eibhear ordained that lots should be cast for their artists, when Eireamhón had parted from him amid the Gaels (?)
6. To Eibhear—what prize could be greater ?—fell then the musician : against his soft face, bright, gentle and fair, the lot was successful.
7. The kingship of music is thine henceforth, following the track of the royal youths : Eibhear Fionn's ancient race has an inheritance that uplifts the mind.
8. Had it not been so before, now at least the root of music is in Munster's plain, a statement that can be vouched for.
9. To-day Blind Nicholas, for correctness and power of melody, has the Champion's Portion [2] of the music of Banbha, the foundation of the knowledge of art.
10. Framer of mystic feats, thief of the winter night, a stirring of sorrows in the wayward hearts of women, a voice one would not think to hear in fairyland.
11. Cause of the cherishing of grief, expert in exalting courage, melody that shortens long days, sweet as the cuckoo in May.
12. The brute beasts sleep at the beauty of his playing : harkening to the dying strains from his quick fingers, the bird would wait to be struck.
13. More in number than the growing grass is that which spreads from the hands of Nicholas, the swaths of his calm and dewy arms, of the bright reed-growth of tuneful strings.[3]
14. Like a carven image, one knows not that it is not human,[4] is the dead-clear melody of his happy (?) finger to kindle the imprisoned music.

---

[1] The tower in Spain from which the Milesians first saw Ireland, according to the Book of Invasions.

[2] A reference to the prize in Bricriu's Feast.

[3] If I understand the text aright, the harper is pictured as a mower sweeping swaths of melody from his harp. But the text is uncertain.

[4] Lit. of natural folk ; The idea seems to be that as the image may be mistaken for a living being, so the harp in the hands of this perfect artist seems to be alive. But the true reading is doubtful.

THE BRITISH IN EGYPT.

BY RAPHAEL NAKHLA.

[The writer of the following article is a native-born Egyptian who, by education and travel, has had exceptional opportunities of forming an unbiassed judgment on the matters discussed by him. He does not, as one might expect, examine the question of Egypt's capacity for self-government; but in a covering letter he gave this answer: "Egyptians may not be quite capable of governing themselves without foreign assistance; but that does not give the English any right to govern them. No man may forcibly enter the house of his neighbour under the pretext of putting it in order."—EDITOR.]

EGYPT rebelled against British rule on two different occasions during 1919. In its double character of violence and universality this movement of revolt was unquestionably one of the most acute crises through which this country passed in its long and chequered history. But to understand the origin of the crisis it is not enough to study the events which immediately provoked it. These have only a minor importance beside the more remote and deeper causes. They were only the spark applied to the explosive materials which had been accumulating during the thirty-seven years of British occupation.

Let us attempt, therefore, to unravel those deeper causes. Lord Curzon recently said in the House of Lords that the Egyptian troubles arose chiefly from the high cost of living and from certain European influences. To speak thus is to show a lamentable ignorance of what is happening on the banks of the Nile or is an attempt to cloak the grave responsibilities of England; for it must be said, and said openly, that the faults of England during

thirty-seven years of occupation have been the cause why the entire Egyptian people rose in revolt. It is these faults that we propose to enumerate, convinced that their slow but steady accumulation will show how inevitable was a general rising. All statements will be based on well-known facts, facts which many Englishmen, and even the British Government, often recognised.

THE ORIGINAL FAULT OF THE BRITISH OCCUPATION.

Admitting that England lawfully occupied Egypt in 1882 as a consequence of the revolt of Arabi Pasha, in order to avenge the violated rights of her own nationals and to safeguard their interests in the future, still the first principles of international law, recognised by the solemn and reiterated promises of the British Government, required that the occupation should cease when order was restored and the rights of British residents guaranteed. These two objects were soon secured. But Egypt was too good a prize to be abandoned for mere scruples about international justice.

According to the Treaty of London (1840) Egypt was in reality a Turkish province. It enjoyed, however, complete control over its internal affairs and a limited control over its foreign relations. It was, therefore, practically independent. Now Egypt has never renounced this independence, which was recognised by England, Russia, Prussia and Austria, the signatories to the Treaty of London. She has always defended it against every attack. The revolt of Arabi Pasha in 1882 was such a defence, and Lord Cromer, the first High Commissioner sent to Egypt, described this revolt as "a national and liberal revolution." Egypt has never ceased to demand the evacuation of the British troops, and English Ministers have again and again given solemn engagements that the withdrawal would take place as soon as order was restored. Order will be restored when England wishes it—which

means at the Greek Kalends. She has now played this comedy on the Egyptian stage for thirty-seven years, and seems quite pleased with the performance in spite of the hisses and cries of the audience.

The Faults of the Occupation up to 1914.

We have no intention of drawing up a complete catalogue of these faults. We shall concern ourselves merely with a few which have especially irritated Egyptians and which paved the way to the risings of 1919. The first fault has been the systematic invasion of all branches of the Egyptian administration by English advisers. Very modest at first, these advisers soon became the masters of the different ministries. They claimed absolute authority over Egyptian officials, and even over Ministers of State, and they did this with an insolence all the more galling because they had no clearly-defined responsibility and had practically no master to exact an account of their stewardship. This master was evidently not Egypt under British tutelage. Neither was it the High Commissioner, the real ruler of Egypt; for he had more important work to supervise than the many-sided activities of these advisers.

What was the natural result of this practical irresponsibility? Interference by Englishmen in matters outside their jurisdiction and consequent irritation of Egyptians, that was the result. But, lest the reader may think that we are exaggerating the situation, we shall quote the words of an Englishman well versed in Egyptian affairs—Sir Valentine Chirol :—

> The task in front of us in this respect will be to unravel the tangled texture of confused powers and responsibilities into which the executive authority vested in the Egyptian Government alone and the advisory functions of the British control have been fitfully woven during nearly four decades of British occupation and to devise a system of advisory co-operation free from the reproach of arbitrary interference (*Times*, January 3, 1920).

The second fault is the appointment of Englishmen, often young and incompetent, to most of the high posts in the Egyptian administration. This fault also Sir Valentine Chirol recognised: "Even at the present moment young Englishmen are coming out by every mail to take up posts in the Egyptian public services, though the [Milner] Commission may quite conceivably decide that they ought to be reserved for young Egyptians" (*Times*, December 22, 1919). And Coles Pasha, who was long in the Egyptian service, wrote to the same effect in the same paper (December 28):—

> There was nothing temporary about a young man from a University who, after selection, had spent one year in England learning Arabic: he came out to stay, but as an "improver" to learn his job at the expense of the State. He had a smattering of Arabic, it is true; but there was little that he could teach, at least for the first few years. Yet Mudirs [Governors of Provinces] and others soon learned that their future career largely depended on the reports made by these young men to their respective advisers. Is there any wonder that the servant soon became the master?

The Egyptians, even the most advanced Nationalists, do not oppose the admission into the public service of a certain number of Englishmen provided they are highly competent, especially in scientific and technical matters. They must recognise, and do recognise that they will need the expert advice of foreigners for a considerable time. But what they cannot tolerate at any price is the invasion of most of the high administrative posts by young and incompetent Englishmen to the exclusion of Egyptians, who nevertheless have to shoulder the onerous burden of providing fat incomes for this army of invaders.

But there is a still more intolerable wrong. These high officials often treat their inferiors, nay their equals, with an imperious and contemptuous insolence. There is nothing strange in this when we remember the many humiliations which the late Khedive, Abbas Hilmy II., suffered at the hands of Lord Cromer. It is unnecessary

to say that, outside the precincts of the Government offices, social intercourse between English and Egyptians does not exist. They are two clans, living side by side, each entrenched within the walls of its own camp. In view of the great psychological differences between the two races, it would be unjust to accuse the English as wholly responsible for this estrangement. But if it is not to receive a sinister interpretation in the minds of Egyptians, Englishmen should at least show themselves less arrogant in their official relations with inferiors and equals. Let us quote once more Sir Valentine Chirol :—

> The Egyptian Nationalists demand that in future Englishmen in the Egyptian service shall be the servants and not the masters of the Egyptian Government. That demand would scarcely have been put forward in such a categorical form, had there not been a tendency on the part of some British officials in the later years of the occupation to treat their Egyptian colleagues as in every way their inferiors and to discourage even the ordinary courtesies of social intercourse with them (*Times*, December 22).

The third fault of the government of occupation was to deliberately neglect the spread of education amongst all classes. Here are a few significant figures. The Egyptian revenue has steadily increased until in 1918-1919 it reached the sum of £27,661,289. And yet the English, who are at the head of the administration, have long devoted to the elementary education of a population of thirteen millions only £20,000—less than 4d. per head. Is it astonishing that, after thirty-seven years of occupation undertaken with the ostensible object of civilising Egypt, 92 per cent. of the men and 997 in every 1,000 of the women were illiterate according to the census of 1907 ? Have the new masters of Egypt done better for secondary education ? Not in the least. In a report covering the last ten years and drawn up by Mr. Boyd Carpenter, Adviser to the Ministry of Education in 1918, this official called attention to a steady decrease in the number of candidates who passed the Matriculation, a decrease

for which the public schools were responsible. Have the English at least provided university and technical education on a scale adequate to meet the needs of the country? Sir Valentine Chirol (*Times*, December 30) has to confess No. The few Schools of Medicine and Law, one Technical and one Training College—most of which existed before the advent of the English—cannot be said to satisfy the needs of a people more and more eager for higher education. In 1916, for instance, out of 619 matriculated students who sought admission to the higher schools 341—more than half—had to be turned away because there was no room for them. The Medical School qualifies only 50 doctors each year in a country which is in want of hundreds. Of course Englishmen and others rush in to fill the vacant posts and batten on the Egyptians. The British occupation, however, has been responsible for two notable improvements in these schools—the substitution of English for Arabic and of English professors for Egyptian. The latter still hold a few minor lecturerships. But the reader may ask: What about the University at Cairo? Does it not owe its origin to the English? Certainly not. The government of occupation simply ignored the project, which was carried to a successful issue by private initiative and private funds. To sum up—The government of occupation, long represented by Mr. Dunlop, Adviser to the Ministry of Education, confined its civilising efforts to the mental equipment of those minor officials necessary for the running of the Anglo-Egyptian administration.

To the three grave faults just examined several others could be added—for instance, the studied strangulation of all efforts to create native industries. We shall cite one typical case. In 1908 an Eastern industrialist approached the Ministry of the Interior for a permit to found a boot factory on a big scale. He had made a thorough study of this industry and had all the necessary capital. The British authorities refused the permit.

Again, Egypt comes second in the list of countries which export cotton to England. Suppose she desired (and she did desire) to found a cotton industry, what a roar would go up from the Lancashire mills! And yet, if the English had the interests of the Egyptians really at heart, ought they not to have stimulated this industry? However, charity begins at home, and it would be too much to expect the invader to establish rivals to Lancashire on the banks of the Nile.

If the Egyptians had remained silent during those thirty-seven years, the British Government might plead some excuse for exploiting the country to the detriment of its vital interests. But it received many an energetic protest, especially from Moustapha Kamel Pasha, the beloved and eloquent leader of the National Party. British Ministers have always recognised the justice of these protests and have repeatedly promised redress. But they never took any serious action. To justify their *laisser-faire* attitude, they pretended that the disorders of the Egyptian body politic had their principal source in the system of Capitulations. This is not the place to show the baseless character of this apologia. Whoever knows anything about Egyptian affairs will only shrug his shoulders and smile.

The Proclamation of the Protectorate in 1914.

Four months after the Great War had broken out England thought that the moment, so long awaited, for the formal annexation of Egypt had at last arrived. What happened? Abbas II., who since his elevation to the throne in 1892 was never allowed to exercise any real power, was suspected of inviting his suzerain, the Sultan of Turkey, to aid him in expelling the usurpers. Immediately England dethroned and banished him from his country. She profited of this occasion to break the link of vassalage which up to that moment had bound

Egypt to the Ottoman Empire. Then she raised to the throne a man from whom she had nothing to fear—Hussein Pasha, uncle of the dethroned Khedive. On him she conferred the pompous and empty title of Sultan, in order to mark more clearly his complete independence of Turkey. As if it was the Sultan of Stamboul who limited the autonomy of the Khedive of Cairo!

What did the Egyptians think of this proclamation of a British Protectorate? The new Sultan and many leading Egyptians believed it to be a provisional measure dictated by the necessities of war, and notably by the fear more or less justified of an understanding between the Egyptians and the Turks with a view to the expulsion of the English. The moment was not favourable for heated discussions or long explanations, and consequently the Egyptians postponed to a later date the question of their violated rights. In the meantime, they had to suffer other violations. For instance, the General Assembly, the last bulwark of their political liberties, was also suppressed early in the war. And all this time England was vociferously proclaiming to the world that she was fighting to avenge the violated rights of small nations!

The suppression of the General Assembly was the second slap in the face of Egypt. England now began to fear that she had gone too far, that she had seriously compromised her authority in the country. She could not forget that she was at war with Mohammedans and their Caliph, the Sultan of Turkey, and that this made her position all the less secure in a Mohammedan country like Egypt. Hence her proclamation at the end of 1914 which officially promised that she alone would bear the whole weight of the struggle against Turkey and that the Mussulmans of Egypt would not be called on to take up arms against their co-religionists of the Ottoman Empire. This precaution, however, did not seem adequate. Hence a second measure—a demand made

to Rushdy Pasha, the Prime Minister, that he should solemnly guarantee the loyalty of his compatriots during the war. This guarantee Rushdy Pasha could not give without consulting Zaghloul Pasha, the leader of the Nationalists. The latter, after weighing the *pros* and *cons*, promised that he and his followers would use every effort to prevent the Egyptians from revolting or reinforcing the Turkish army which was then advancing on the Suez Canal.

Faults of the Protectorate during the War.

Zaghloul Pasha and the Egyptians kept their promise. What would have become of the Protectorate and what would have been the issue of the campaign in Palestine, if Egypt had joined hands with Turkey in 1915? At that date the Turkish army, commanded by Germans, was already operating on Egyptian territory. But Egypt had given a solemn engagement, and she kept it. England, on the other hand, broke her promise not to force on her *protégés* any participation, direct or indirect, in a war against Mohammedans. It is true that her violation of this pact was cleverly masked. At first she commandeered from the peasants forage, corn and cotton Small landowners and those who had no land were thus often forced to procure at exhorbitant prices the quantity imposed by the military authorities and to accept for it the price fixed by them. In 1917-1918 these exactions could be counted by the thousand and became all the more exasperating as they fell on the fellaheen (Egyptian peasants) whose poverty is proverbial. After that the British commandeered asses and camels—always from the poverty-stricken peasants. A reasonable hire, of course, was given, but not sufficient to make adequate compensation for the agricultural losses suffered in consequence. Besides, many of the commandeered animals died during the campaign, and as the indemnity for such losses was based on pre-war prices, and as the prices of beasts of

burden in Egypt had doubled or trebled, the reader can easily imagine the plight of the peasants. But all that was a trifling grievance beside the E. L C. (Egyptian Labour Corps). For the Gallipoli, and above all for the Palestine campaigns, the British had need of a whole army of workers to dig trenches and construct railways. The formal promise of 1914, however, prevented the recruitment of this corps from amongst Egyptian Mohammedans. But a subterfuge was easily found—attractive terms were offered for volunteers. These terms were a regular daily wage of one shilling, good food, clothing, and a contract rescindable by either party after one hundred days.[1] Thousands enrolled. But on the one hand the need of workers grew with the extension of the military operations, and on the other hand the labour recruits, disillusioned by the severity of the work, declined re-engagement. How did the British meet this situation? Still maintaining the fiction of voluntary service, they ordered each of the 3,600 Egyptian mayors to procure a certain number of workers. The mayors discovered in this injunction an easy instrument to satisfy personal spite or personal greed. In the name of the British Protectorate they conscripted their enemies or those who refused to pay a round sum for exemption. The unfortunate victims often deserted their villages before the fatal day appointed for enlistment. In such cases agents went in pursuit of the fugitive "volunteer," captured and beat him mercilessly, and then entered his name in the E. L C.[2]

How were these strange volunteers treated during the course of a long and trying campaign? An eye-witness, who followed all the military operations in Syria, describes

[1] The average daily wage of a fellah is one shilling; but he has no security of regular employment. This the British guaranteed; also good food and clothing. The latter consisted of a linen or cotton vest and a trousers which left the calves bare to receive the strokes of the overseer's whip. One hundred days always remained the official duration of the contract—renewable by either party.

[2] See *Daily News*, March 28, 1919.

for us the revolting spectacle of British officers whipping these wretched workers—treating them as animals rather than as human beings. And Sir Valentine Chirol, who puts their number at about 500,000, admits that "there have been unpleasant stories of inadequate medical stores and bad hospital arrangements," that "no information is available as to the casualties," that these casualties, "though they must have been considerable (if only from sickness and exposure), appear never to have been notified to the families" (*Times*, January 1, 1920).[1] Captain Wedgwood Benn declared last May in the House of Commons that the loss caused to Egypt by levies of men and agricultural products was estimated at £20,000,000. It is unnecessary to say that, during the war and even at the end of 1919, the Protectorate Government forbade the Egyptian press to publish any criticism of its odious acts.

After the signing of the armistice, did the "Protectors" of Egypt recognise the injustice of their rule and plead, as extenuating cause, the exigencies of war? Did they try, by a judicious distribution of indemnities, to repair the wrong done to the peasants? Not at all. They did not even express officially their gratitude for the signal services rendered and without which, in the opinion of the English themselves, the Syrian campaign would have infallibly failed. Sir Valentine Chirol has written :—

> After all, without the Egyptian Labour Corps to build its railways and Egyptian supplies to feed it, the Palestine expedition would have been materially almost impossible, and some expression of gratitude from British Ministers would not have marred its glory. But the saving word was never spoken (*Times*, January 1, 1920).

---

[1] "Though much that has been said about the Egyptian Labour Corps is exaggerated, it is unfortunately true that its recruitment was very unwisely managed, and that its sufferings through hardship and disease were very heavy" (*New Statesman*, Nov. 29, 1919).

The Troubles of 1919.

It is easy to imagine the oppressive atmosphere of general and bitter discontent which hung over Egypt at the conclusion of the war. This atmosphere became still more threatening under the strain of a violent economic crisis. During the four years of war the Egyptian workers saw their masters amass huge fortunes whilst the increasing cost of living reduced them almost to misery. The consequence here as elsewhere was a series of acute labour troubles—a general strike throughout the State railways, tramway strikes in Cairo and Alexandria, and other stoppages of a more localised but none the less disturbing character. All this time England observed a haughty silence with regard to her intentions in Egypt and obstinately refused to define the precise scope of the Protectorate. Hence the growing suspicions that she meant to abrogate or alter the fundamental laws of the country. Had she not already suppressed the General Assembly? Did we not see her installed at our doors as sovereign in Palestine, Mesopotamia, and part of Syria? These annexations, whether temporary or permanent, were well calculated to awaken Egyptian fears.

At the end of the war Rushdy Pasha was still Prime Minister and Zaghloul Pasha leader of the Nationalists. These two had guaranteed Egyptian loyalty during the war and had fulfilled their engagements. It was now their duty to defend the rights of their country openly menaced. Accordingly, in the name of their people, they asked that the Egyptian question be submitted to the Peace Conference. Lord Curzon, in the House of Lords, gave the laconic reply that there was no Egyptian question. No Egyptian question!—and the country was just then passing through a political and economic crisis of the first magnitude. There still remained a door of escape for Rushdy Pasha and Zaghloul Pasha. They applied to the British authorities in Cairo for passports to go

and plead their cause in London. Again a blank refusal was the answer. The Prime Minister now handed in his resignation. The waves of Egyptian indignation were rising fast. On March 9, 1919, the dams burst and the general revolt began.

The British authorities immediately arrested the Nationalist leaders and deported them to Malta. They did the same with other Egyptians whom they considered too zealous in defending the national cause. But these violent and arbitrary measures only made the people more determined in their fight for freedom. Then took place an event unique perhaps in Egyptian history. From one end of the country to the other, in the valley of the Nile, from Assouan to Cairo, to Alexandria, to Port Said, the whole body of government officials, who never before (at least in public) took any part in political agitations, judging that the situation created by England was intolerable and inimical to the national life, had the courage to risk all for the good of their country—they struck work for several days (March and April, 1919). There was a general stoppage throughout the whole public service. Then followed imposing manifestations in Cairo and Alexandria. Long processions of all classes marched through the principal streets in an impressive silence or shouting "Long live Egypt"! "Long live her independence!" "Down with England"! In these processions you saw side by side government officials, merchants, students, workmen. Even battalions of women—a phenomenon hitherto unknown in the East—took their place in these processions or drove in carriages through the streets, waving Egyptian flags and uttering the same cries of revolt. They even helped to erect barricades, and when victims fell behind these barricades they followed the funeral cortèges rending the air with their lamentations.

We have spoken of the victims. They were many. Since the revolutionary troubles at Alexandria in 1882,

people had not witnessed such hecatombs. Passing over the numerous shootings by the police, armoured cars paraded the streets ready to disperse crowds with a hail of bullets. The exact figure of the victims shot cannot be given; but according to some estimates there were 800 killed and 1,600 wounded;[1] the number of arrests went beyond computation.

The revolutionary movement was not confined to the great cities. The peasants, whose patience and even apathy born of long centuries of oppression are notorious, were persuaded that the growing encroachments of England meant a revival of the hated tyranny of Khedive Ismail Pasha. And so they also rose *en masse* at a given signal, destroyed railways and telegraph wires, and (as ever happens in such movements) perpetrated some brutal murders. All this was done to the cry of "Down with the English"![2]

The British Foreign Office at last opened its eyes to the real gravity of the situation. Orders were issued to release Zaghloul Pasha and the other deported Nationalists. Moreover passports were at once granted to those whom the country had chosen as delegates to the Peace Conference—England having arranged, of course, that they should not be heard. This victory, somewhat unexpected, heartened the national leaders to continue the fight. However, in view of the ferocious manner in which any demonstration was suppressed, they judged it wiser to abandon little by little all violent measures. The government clerks returned to their desks, the economic life of the country was resumed, and the British authorities congratulated themselves on having restored "law and order."

[1] These figures will, no doubt, appear exaggerated; but we must remember the Amritsar massacre of April 11, 1919. The official figures for that massacre—a ten minutes incident of Punjab history—were 500 killed and 1,500 wounded. Under the direction of General Dyer the soldiers continued to fire on an unarmed crowd until they ran short of ammunition.

[2] The universal character of the revolt was strikingly illustrated by the fact that the cross took its place beside the crescent in the banners of the revolutionists.

On November 12, 1919, Marshal Allenby, the conqueror of Palestine, arrived in Cairo as High Commissioner. It was he who ordered the release of those interned at Malta and the issue of passports to the delegates to the Peace Conference. Relying on the effect of this concession and on his own personal prestige, he proceeded to inaugurate his government with the following proclamation :—

> The policy of Great Britain in Egypt is to safeguard the autonomy of the country under the British Protectorate and to establish here an autonomous government under the direction of a native ruler. The object of Great Britain is also to protect Egypt from external aggression and foreign intervention. She wishes moreover to found, under her own guidance, as far as this will be necessary, a constitution which will give his Majesty the Sultan, his Ministers, and the representatives of the people an increasing share in the management of public affairs. Accordingly the Government of his Britannic Majesty has decided to send to Egypt a Commission entrusted with the task of accomplishing this work. . . .

The reader can easily imagine the general indignation created by this proclamation. The agitation, which had died down, revived once more. The whole country was in a state of volcanic eruption. It refused to parley with the Milner Commission. Telegrams of protest poured into Cairo from all sides. The Prime Minister was forced to hand in his resignation. The Sultan, who was taking a rest in his palace at Alexandria, had to return hurriedly and incognito to his capital. The people got wind of this sudden return, flocked to the great railway station, forced an entrance and lined up along the platform. When their sovereign stepped from his carriage, he was greeted with the frantic cries of "We demand our independence and liberty"! "Down with the Milner Commission"!

On November 15th thousands marched to the palace of Abdin. They wished to enter and to present in person their demands to the Sultan. The Egyptian police, commanded by English officers, refused admittance.

Then followed a free fight with bayonets, rifles, stones and other improvised weapons. Next day another collision equally violent occurred at the same and at other parts of the city. During these two days there were 30 killed and more than 160 wounded in Cairo.

Alexandria was also the scene of serious trouble. The English garrison had to replace the Egyptian police. In order to dominate the city by machine guns they caused certain vantage points to be evacuated. They also forbade circulation in the streets after 9 p.m.

We have described only the manifestations in the two principal cities; but they had the same character of universality as those of March and April. They extended throughout Egypt and embraced every class. Copts and Mussulmans marched side by side and expressed their feelings in the same cry: "Down with the Milner Commission"! "Long live independence"!

The Commission, which arrived at Cairo on December 7th, saw itself boycotted by all Egyptians. Lord Milner, alarmed by this general hostility, published in the *Official Journal* of December 29th the following statement:—

The British Mission, struck with the existence of a widespread belief that the object of its coming is to deprive Egypt of rights hitherto possessed by her, states that there is no foundation whatever for that belief.

The British Government sent the Mission out with the approval of the British Parliament to reconcile Egyptian aspirations with Great Britain's special interests in Egypt, and with the maintenance of the legitimate rights of foreign residents. We are convinced that with the good will on both sides this object can be attained. It is the sincere desire of the Mission to see the relations between Great Britain and Egypt established on a basis of friendly accord, and to put an end to friction, thus enabling Egyptians to devote their whole energies to the development of the country under self-governing institutions. . . .

On the following day the Nationalists issued this reply:—

The Committee would have wished that Lord Milner's statement had been more definite and more explicit in recognising the independence of Egypt. It is not such as to decide Egypt to change her attitude towards the Commission. The reconciliation of our

independence with the interests of England ought to be the object of a discussion with the Egyptian delegation, but on the understanding that there shall be no encroachment on the sacred rights of Egypt. Long live Egypt! Long live complete independence!

These demands were immediately supported by Prince Kemal ed Dinn, son of the late Sultan Hussein I., by Prince Omar Toussoun and by other members of the reigning family. All appealed to Lord Milner to do justice to the wishes of the nation. But no one, or practically no one, accepted the invitation to discuss matters with the Commission. In this quandary Lord Milner paid an unofficial visit to the Grand Mufti, the head of the Moslem religion in Egypt, and had a long conversation with him. A résumé of this conversation was published in a Cairo newspaper on January 3rd. We give a few of the Grand Mufti's answers :—

No Egyptian would enter upon a discussion except on the basis of independence.

Every country has its traitors ; but any patriot would refuse to discuss.

The entire nation claims independence, and it would therefore be useless to speak in any other language. I do not forget your power ; but if Egyptians bend to-day before force, they will profit by the first occasion to revolt. The guarantee of force is not eternal.

These are the facts of the Egyptian situation. What turn will they take ? It is more than probable that the Milner Commission will concede very little to our national aspirations. Human psychology and still more human experience have taught us that, with very rare exceptions, the interests of the weak will always be sacrificed to the interests of the strong. There is no sign, alas ! that the war has ushered in a new world of international justice. Egypt has neither cannons nor armoured cars nor tanks, and so she must bow for the present to these instruments of modern justice which a foreign power has trained on her from the high places of her cities. But, as the Grand Mufti has said, the guarantee of force is not eternal.

Raphael Nakhla.

SOME UNPUBLISHED MANGAN MSS.

EDITED BY PROFESSOR GEORGE O'NEILL, S.J., M.A.

A REVEREND correspondent who resides in England has supplied us with a few MS. pages of James Clarence Mangan's with which (as far as they are likely to be of interest) we desire to acquaint our readers. It cannot be said that anything of striking merit or moment here makes its first appearance. Mangan produced a great deal of what his admirers readily admit to have been of quite inferior quality—things written because of extrinsic pressure, or the mere *jeux-d'esprit* of a too aimless mind. His editors indeed have been rather over-willing, in our opinion, to take up this depreciatory view of Mangan's productions; hence some really fine things of his are difficult to find—Mitchel may have it, or O'Donoghue, or Miss Guiney: one never knows beforehand. It is a pity to have to go back to Mitchel to find such a thing as Mangan's version of Bürger's *Lenore*. We may trust it was the fault of space-grudging publishers rather than of the editorial tastes that have left the O'Donoghue and Guiney volumes bare of so masterly a translation of a masterly ballad. But there is no doubt at all that Mangan left an immense quantity of chaff to be winnowed away from his grain, an immense quantity of quartz and gravel to obscure his gold; and of the more precious matters the present pages cannot claim to offer much.

Of their authenticity there can be no doubt. Mangan's hand-writing and the general turn-out of his MSS. is not easily mistaken. We have the collection sponsored by a letter from Wm. F. Gibbons, dated May 8th, 1869,

and addressed to W. J. Hayes, Bett's Terrace. Mr. Hayes was a member of the family of Miss Catherine Hayes, who is thought to have been a personage of some moment in the poet's life. He taught her German and French in 1831, and seems to have deeply regretted her early death, which took place in 1832. Some have believed she was the object of the intense and hopeless passions of which some of his poems speak; others, with greater probability, deny this identification. Mangan's friendship with the Hayes family lasted, though (as the following letter testifies) not without interruption or coolness, up to the time of his own death.

The letter is, perhaps, worth giving nearly in full, especially as it is brief:—

My Dear Hayes,

I have to thank you for the great amount of trouble you have taken in supplying me with those magnificent effusions of poor Mangan. I have (and prize them too) some autograph MSS. of his which you gave me some time ago. I am sure you must feel pained at the circumstance of leaving Dublin not thoroughly reconciled to him.

It is to be deplored that too frequently men of gigantic mind allow themselves to drift as it were insensibly into scepticism on matters of revealed religion. Mangan's belief was (unhappily like many more of the world's great men) that the human mind should be thoroughly unshackled: all else they consider intolerance. Yet must we not deal too harshly with them, for after all they are gentle and noble spirits. Somebody says—I can't just now remember who it is:—"The only true spirit of tolerance consists in our conscientious toleration of each other's intolerance."

. . . I shall now conclude by assuring you I shall endeavour to follow your advice by giving the *Bobbies* a wide berth. Yours very faithfully,

Wm. F. Gibbons.

The question of Mangan's "scepticism" comes naturally in connection with one of the MSS we are about to speak of. We do not think there is much in Mr. Gibbons' remarks that need disturb those who like to

think of Mangan as a good Catholic. Such he was, according to irrefragable evidence; but tolerant in the extreme he also certainly would be. In his curious character there was a strong element of Montaigne—a speculative acuteness, a practical inertia, an indifference, usually good-humoured, to issues that impassion others, indeed a real vein of cynicism, appearing at an unusually early age. To a display of more militant scepticism, not really felt, we could imagine him easily provoked by less nimble-witted interlocutors of the type of Mr. Gibbons. Even highly orthodox people do not always resist the temptation to shock their over-precise and narrowly-orthodox neighbours; witness the late Coventry Patmore and his fondness for somewhat startling jokes and ironies.

The chief of these MSS. is in prose. It is a letter, covering nearly the whole of four large folio pages, written very small in Mangan's exquisite and clear script, and running to some 5,400 words! Truly, a generous piece of letter-writing, especially as no matter of urgent practical importance inspired its composition. It treats "my dear Tynan," to comments, maxims, quotations quibbles and puns on all manner of subjects. Among these some are mentioned which seem to fix the date of the letter at about 1832, when Mangan was about thirty, and was occupied in scrivenery-work with a lawyer named Leland.

Of the irregular habits, the struggle for existence, the inner troubles, which from other evidences we are led to ascribe to him at this time as well as both earlier and later, the letter bears no more trace in its tone or its topics than in its fine calligraphy. As far as all these indications go, the strange writer might have been a comfortable dilettante, writing amid the cigar-smoke of a university common-room, instead of the weird Ishmael of the Dublin lanes whom Mitchel and Burton have pictured, and whom many tried in vain to reclaim. The numerous trivialities (all quite inoffensive) of this curious

human document we shall omit without scruple, giving only its more substantial portions.

You know . . . that I know nothing whatever about Politics. . . I am quite of opinion with Washington Irving that there are and have ever been but two distinct political parties in the world, the one being the predominant party and the other wanting to become the predominant party. The first party are always for killing the second. Thus *L'Apostolique* recommended the killing of La Fayette and the Duke of Newcastle recommended the killing of O'Connell. On the other hand the second party are always for deposing the first party, as everybody knows. But beyond the mere merits of the killing and deposing systems respectively, neither party No. I. nor party No. II. exhibit any particularity of a particularly particular nature. With respect to the people, *le peuple souverain*, etc., etc., there is very little wisdom among them either, in any town or country . . . but there is proportionally as much ambition, thirst of domination on a smaller scale and within a pettier sphere, as anyone can meet with at Court. The difference between the people that are at Court and those that are not at Court I think to be this : the first attend levees, dress magnificently, pocket pensions and do nothing ; the second are desirous of being able to attend levees, dress magnificently, pocket pensions and do nothing. The first are the INS, the last the OUTS . . .

You talk about newspapers and their venality. The venality of newspapers is a matter of course. It is the fifth element of those who edit them. . . The Periodical Press is a dead weight upon the vitality of society, a drag upon the intellect of mankind, an incubus over us all. It is, I rather think, firstly a curse, secondly a scourge, thirdly a bore, fourthly an evil, fifthly an eye-sore, sixthly a bugbear, seventhly an ugliness, eighthly an horror, ninthly a woe, and tenthly an abomination, not that spoken of by Daniel the prophet, but as bad. . . I think, with Diogenes, the Caliph Omar, and Mygasarus, that books are too numerous. A proposal was made some time ago in the N. M. M. for setting fire to Paternoster Row, but nobody chose to hang the bell about the cat's neck, and the affair dropped. . .

I must say with regard to (but without any regard *for*) Cobbett, that he is a tremendous weight when he has anybody or any system to tumble down upon ; deprive him, though, of these, and he looks as Hercules at the distaff did ; he becomes the flattest, deadest, spiritlessest proser at all. . . He says a few new things, and a

few true things, but the true are not new, and the new are not true. He is a good farmer, not a bad lawyer, a passable historian, and, if not an Alcides in politics, he is at least an All-sides, which he thinks better. . . His knowledge of the world is perfect; but as Huygens and Herschel acquaint us, there are spots on the sun, and nobody can be an admirable Crichton A.D. 1832. . . Hazlitt's character of Cobbett is the best I have seen. . .

Religion and politics are grave things to analyse, but it strikes me that they are more intimately connected each with each than it is the fashion to imagine. . . The best statesmen the world ever saw have been religious men, witness Ximenes, and, *vice-versa*, witness Richelieu.

. . . I wonder whether Bentham in his book of Fallacies has noticed this fallacy about society; it is one that should be exposed and exploded at once. People are prone to talk about the human race as though it were one body animated by one soul; just as Kircher supposed the Earth to be a living animal, and Spinoza believed the universe to be God. Even Tom Moore says that the bondage that Venice groans under at present is a chastisement for *her* wickedness 200 years ago!—"Desolate Venice! when I track *thy* course of crime in ages back, etc., etc." But the absurdity of this is clearly pointed out by Dr. Bowring in the *Westminster Review*. "Certain persons, Venetians (says the Dr.) committed great atrocities in the year 1620; therefore certain other persons, Venetians, are to suffer the punishment of this in 1823." Leave such views of society, my dear Tynan, to those who carry the nursery along with them to old age. Nobody is bound to any other person. . . I can do what I will with myself and my own, provided I don't contravene conscience. . . You are to swallow all this, however, with a grain or two of salt, because, as I have already said, I don't wish to dogmatize.

Revolutions, and Constitutions, and Charts, and Diplomacy, and Père Enfantin and his chimæras, and St. Simon and his organic periods, and Robert Owen and his New Structure of Society, his Grand Plan for the Abolition of Evil, his parallelograms and his Science of Circumstances—all these things and beings were at first very wonderful to me and are now very weariful to me; I have small sympathy with any of them; I have tired of all of them. I am a lover of liberty, such liberty as is to be had in this world, just as I am a lover of fresh air, good health, idleness, gay society, solitude, etc., etc., but I claim no merit for being so. . . I think the man who labours to earn the price of a pair of boots for himself proportionately entitled to as many encomiums as the man who

kills other people that he may procure freedom for himself. Depend upon it that self is at the bottom of every struggle. . .

Whether the Parisians during the days of "la petite semaine" [the Revolution of July, 1830] were inspired by an angel or driven by a devil each, to do what they did, I shall forbear to enquire because nobody can tell me. But that the transaction first and last would turn out a glorious blunder was foreseen by every one who possessed any more sagacity than characterizes butterflies generally. I am not the apologist of kings; I take divine right to be an unintelligibility of the muddiest pattern. . . But yet I am unable to feel as you do with regard to equal rights, liberty etc., etc. I have said that I am a lover of this world's liberty, and so I am, but I never loved it passionately, because it is not the creature of my imagination, the *beau-ideal* of my aspirations. . . . I am occasionally metaphysical . . . and having meditated twice or thrice upon the question, my conclusion is this: that political liberty is not worth a grain of chaff. Take notice that I speak for myself only. If I were to-morrow to enter into possession of all the advantages that the best of good governments have ever been able to bestow, I would feel precisely as an individual would who, suffering under a complication of maladies, gout, palsy, stone, phthisis, scrofula, cancer, dropsy, cholic, catarrh, epilepsy, etc., etc., should find himself one morning freed from a little wen upon his thumb. . . Soame Jenyns has shown to the perfect satisfaction of himself and me that no man can ever attain any liberty worth speaking of beyond the liberty of mere Volition. . . But the march of intellect is growing a Dead March latterly and will be apt to terminate (as March ought) on some First of April. . . .

A question with myself is—whether I am not intolerably stupid; and such is the depth of my stupidity that I really feel at a loss to decide whether I am or am not stupid. I will give up mooting the point this very day, for the mystery is one that human intelligence is baffled by . . . It mattereth not:—

When men behold cold mould rolled cold around my mound of ground, all crowned with grass, alas!
Mankind, though blind, will find my mind was kind, resigned, refined, but shrined like gas in glass.

And these are two lines that I have a right to pique myself on, for the whole compass of English poetry exhibits nothing like them. . . . One of your principles is that an aristocracy are a gang of robbers, and you think that they ought to cease robbing. Every one who is a robber ought, no doubt, to cease robbing, and

if the aristocracy be robbers, they ought to cease to be so, and they will cease to be so when the shark and the pike and the crocodile become honest and abstemious members of marine society. . . You appear rather surprised that the tax-eaters and old usurers should have gained the whip-hand again in France, but when you are thirty years older, you will feel no surprise whatever at events of this nature. By that time you will see a full-grown aristocracy in America; but even this will awake no wonder within you, because you will see that it was the inevitable result of natural and artificial causes. Just wait until then.

P.S.—Nothing occurs in Ireland. No prospect of a Revolution. A year and a half ago several persons in Dublin—"waiters-of-inns who shone as inn-ov-ators, and slaters wanting to be legislators," workmen with no work to do, and tradeless tradesmen, were growing rapidly insane on the Repeal-of-the-Union question. "That which had made them drunk had made me thoughtful," and I then acquainted all my acquaintance that they would see no change in Ireland but one for the worse—de mal en pis, mes amis, said I—no repeal, no revolution, bloody or bloodless. They who then sneered are now sighing. I should myself like a revolution better than you think, especially if it produced a general transfer of property and I had any prospect of robbing somebody, for my finances are too low for my ideas, which are of the princeliest. . . The principal objection I have to revolutions (particularly French) is that they now and then elevate persons from the lower ranks of society to the highest dignities, and Blackwood's Magazine has proved that elevations of this kind are preposterous. Its argument is profound and unanswerable: "The lower orders never can be properly qualified to legislate for a country, because they are composed of persons drawn from the lowest ranks." An aristocracy besides is necessary for the sake of variety: were we all democrats there would be no variety, and variety is one of the charms of life. . . It will be asserted that I have overlooked an advantage produced by revolutions. . . the change of a brown banner for a buff one, or *vice-versa*. When Charles X-king was Charles Rex (king) the French had merely a flag of one colour; they now have a flag of three colours. . . . It is generally the foremost of all the advantages that the prosers and poets of the Revolution enumerate. . . You may call this enthusiasm, but for my part whenever I am unable to understand a thing well I call it a mystery. . . All that is left to us is to admire the influence of rags and colours, banners, garters, heraldry, humbug and trumpery of all calibres and countries.

If I could by any means divest myself of a horrible species of laziness which constantly seizes me whenever I attempt to probe a political question, I should be glad to enter into an analysis of the arguments for and against Republicanism. In the meantime, my dear fellow, I am a despot in soul, and regard abstract despotism with such a degree of reverence that if the organ of Veneration on my head be not as immeasurable as the base of a respectably-sized mountain, I will add Spurzheim to the other quacks on my list. . . Despotism is a poetical government : there is a romance in the very idea ; all the fairy tales are filled with kings and queens who did what they liked, and what is there so beautiful as the associations connected with a fairy tale ? I prefer them even to the Catholic Association and the Association " Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera," which I translate thus : " Help yourself,—God help you ! "—I am unwilling to break off this abruptly and I therefore intend to cross part of this letter with red ink.

The humorous threat about re-crossing his pages in red ink was not carried out ; but the letter ends rather oddly at the foot of its fourth page, without farewell or signature.

Mangan has not, as far as we know, been compared with his contemporary, Francis Mahony, of " Prout " fame ; but that letter might easily suggest such a comparison. With due condensation and a little stiffening-up with leading-article starch, the Mangan letter could quite easily figure as a " Prout " article. Of the two men and writers Mangan was at once the more poetical and the more cynical. Prout was far more definitely out of sympathy with Irish nationalism in its actual living forms ; he attacked and ridiculed its prominent representatives. Mangan lent his talents to the Young Ireland party. Yet, on the other hand, Prout never became the *poco-curante*, the almost contemptuous onlooker, who thinks no political movement worth our getting excited over it. But Mangan, amid the ardours which burnt around him in the *Nation* office and elsewhere, could not catch and make his own the glow of enthusiasm for any practical endeavour towards the political emancipation of his country. The glorious ideal of his " Dark Rosaleen "

could rouse him to a poet's fervour and a poet's song; but for the actual Ireland that Young Ireland tried to help he had little (even as a poet) to give but high-pitched sermons and prophecies of disaster. It is obvious enough to suggest a connection between his indifference to public matters and his unhappy slavery to certain self-indulgences; but the explanation meets a difficulty in the cool and somewhat "superior" tone in which the non-political poet justifies his non-politics.

Some other MSS. of this small collection find Mangan in the preaching vein. One is a translation of a German poem by Blumauer, beginning "Menschengrössen giebt es zwei hienieden." On the back are no less than three notes to the same effect as this one: "Wm. J. Hayes received this from James Mangan, March, 1834, Dolphin's Barn, near Dublin." Other notes, also apparently in Wm. Hayes' hand, are the following: "Miss Catherine Hayes, German scholar," "James C. Mangan, German Poet, etc., Dublin," "Miss Catherine Hayes, German and French teacher." The poem is of little worth. Blumauer was one of the least respectable personages, whether as man or poet, produced by the German "Aufklärungsperiode," and Mangan fails to put life into Blumauer's rationalistic moralizings.

Another piece is written on the last leaf of a legal document, the concluding few lines of which are penned in a sprawling and ugly hand. Mangan's beautiful script begins a poem of some fifty lines and (it must again be admitted) of very little interest. It recalls the moralizings of Coleridge at his weakest, and it ends with the unhappy rhyme of "world" to "laurelled," which an English reader would not suspect to be meant for a rhyme at all.

A single sheet of foolscap contains no less than seven pieces, including a total of some 270 lines. They were all, according to the testimony of their inscriptions, written between the ages of sixteen and eighteen.

Their themes and sentiments are uniformly gloomy and even gruesome. Vampires, racks and funeral palls help out contemplations on broken hearts and blighted hopes. The following "Lines, written at 17," may serve sufficiently to illustrate these self-expressions of a somewhat morbid adolescence :—

The sun's rich rays have often thrown
A gleam upon the lonely tomb,
And all without hath brightly shone
While all within was ghastly gloom.

Thus may a transient smile impart
Its radiance to the care-worn cheek,
While all within the tomb-like heart
Is dark and drear and coldly bleak.

In a longer and much better poem of later date reflections of a kindred type ascend to a climax in a finely-expressed prayer. A revised version, however, is provided in O'Donoghue's printed copy—better with the exception of one detail which Mangan-lovers will note—the word "waning" in 9th last line, which (we have no doubt) is an unintended repetition from "waning name" of the preceding line, and for which our MS. gives "paling." Appended in pencil to the poem is the note "Mr. Mangan, W. J. Hayes, 4th March, 1839." Apparently 4th March was for some reason marked out for friendly exchanges between Mangan and the Hayeses. The handwriting of this piece is larger than usual and singularly beautiful and clear. There is only one correction in all the eighty lines; not a letter is ill-shaped or ill-proportioned; not a line is out of the horizontal; Mangan, some one said, was "all muscles and nerves": how finely-strung that muscular and nervous system was such MSS as these bear clear witness. Even after 1845, when abuse of alcohol and opium was making wreck of his physique, though some thought they detected a reflection of this sorry change in his handwriting, yet others have denied that any such sign was observable.

We give the conclusion of this poem—it bears here no title, but in O'Donoghue's version it is entitled "Life and its Illusions":—

Ancient of days! Triune,[1] Adored, Unknown,
Who wert, and art, and art to come!—the heart
Yearns in its lucid moods to thee alone.
Thy name is love. Thy word is truth. Thou art
The fount of happiness, the source of glory:
Eternity is in thy hands and power.
Oh, from that Heaven, unrecognised by our
Slow souls, look down upon a world which, hoary
In evil and in error though it be,
Retaineth still some stamp of that primeval
Beauty that bloomed above[2] its brow ere evil
And error wiled it from thy love and thee.

Look down; and if, while human brows are brightening
In godless triumph, angel-eyes be weeping,
Publish thy will in syllables of lightning
And sentences of thunder to the sleeping.
Look down, and renovate the waning name
Of goodness, reillume[3] the paling[4] light
Of truth and purity, that all may aim
At one imperishable crown, the bright
Guerdon which they who by untired and holy
Warfare shall overcome the world, inherit—
The self-denying, the pure in heart, the lowly,
The merciful, the meek, the poor in spirit!

So shall the end of thine all-perfect plan
Be ultimately realized in man.

G. O'Neill.

O'Donoghue versions—[1] First Cause. [2] upon. [3] and relume. [4] waning.

CHRONICLE.

I.—The New President of the French Republic.

BY CHARLES BAUSSAN.

Sic vos non vobis mellificâstis, apes ! If in the course of his journeyings in Egypt it should chance to M. Clemenceau, standing before the Pyramids, to read once more his Virgil, with somewhat of sad irony must he murmur these words. Not for him have been the sweets of office in the Chamber which he had so skilfully constituted. The deputies whose election was due to him have chosen as President of the Republic not him to whom they owed their seats but another. Great has been the surprise for everyone, or almost everyone, both in France and in other countries. It was universally expected that the "Père de la Victoire" would be seen at the Elysée. The day before the Congress of Versailles the betting was 10 to 1 on Clemenceau. He it was who had won the war. How then is it to be explained that M. Deschanel has beaten the favourite and won the race ?

First of all we have to consider that, popular favour notwithstanding, the result of the presidential election is to be regarded very much more as a demonstration *against* M. Clemenceau than in *favour* of M. Deschanel. If France herself had been called upon to choose by means of the plebiscite the President of the Republic, then it is certain that the suffrages of the French people would have been given to Clemenceau, to whom they are grateful, and justly so, for victory, and whom, probably because of certain faults of his, they like also. The high cost of living, which from day to day increasingly dulls the remembrance of the joys of victory, would have deprived the conqueror of the Germans of but a small number of votes.

But the will of a nation often gets a twist, fortunate or unfortunate, when a parliament is the organ of expression. A parliament does not always reason in the same way as the nation. In voting against Clemenceau some of the electors were actuated by honest reasons of state, others by unworthy feelings of enmity. Whilst acknowledging the great services which Clemenceau rendered to France, many politicians maintained that the gratitude incontestably due to him should not be carried so far as to sacrifice the interests of the nation by giving him a post for which he was not qualified.

They reproached him with having at the Peace Conference too blindly adopted the unfortunate ideas of President Wilson, of having made too many concessions to Lloyd George, of having ultimately subscribed to a Treaty which did not afford adequate satisfaction to France.

On the other hand, although Clemenceau on some occasions, by his words and acts, had shown himself favourably disposed towards religion, yet he was regarded as still hostile to the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Therefore, on this point, the Catholics could not but distrust his attitude, just as the devoted adherents of parliamentary doctrines could not but distrust his liking for personal power. Hence, apart from all hostile feeling and in spite even of sympathy with the man himself, in the minds of a great number of the deputies and senators reason argued against his election.

On the extreme Left, in the ranks of the Socialists or Radical Socialists, enmity decided the vote against Clemenceau. This group could not pardon his measures against the *défaitistes*, nor his attitude towards the Bolshevists, nor the arrest of M. Caillaux.

If the Moderates with their reasons, and the Socialists with their enmities, could be combined to make common cause, Clemenceau's election to the Presidency would probably be defeated. In the engineering of this coalition the clever tactician, the Grand Master of lobby intrigues, M. Briand, was the prime mover. He it was who directly or through the instrumentality of well-chosen lieutenants represented M. Deschanel to each party in the manner best calculated to win their support. To the Right and the Centre he was the great *bourgeois*, the true parliamentarian, the man of prudence and *sang-froid*, versed in foreign politics, an advocate of the Embassy to the Vatican; to the extreme Left he was the least high-handed of Presidents, in any case he was the only candidate who could defeat Clemenceau.

A *bloc* was thus formed, a *bloc* composed of the most divergent elements, and it carried the day. At the ballot for the choice of the candidate for the Presidency 408 votes were recorded for Deschanel, 389 only for Clemenceau. Some votes were spoiled, and some were not cast. Had Clemenceau persevered in his candidature it is hard to say what might have happened. The earnest entreaties of his friends notwithstanding, he refused to solicit votes, and at once wrote to the President of the Congress withdrawing his candidature. On the following day M. Deschanel was elected by 734 votes. Choosing between "the glory of past services and the hope of services to be rendered in the future" the National Assembly had chosen hope!

"France expects much from you," said M. Méline, the former President of the Council and author of *Le Salut par la terre*, to M. Deschanel when the result of the voting was announced. Very different were the words which the ballad-makers addressed to the

new tenant of the Elysée. Ballad-makers, as we know, have no respect for the great. Using the familiar "Tu," one of these addresses M. Deschanel as follows :—

On ne peut te reprocher d'avoir fait quelque chose,
Car jamais, non jamais, tu n'as jamais rien fait.
Continue le système, il vaut mieux, je t'assure,
Quand le char de l'Etat risque mille dangers,
Laisser les copains pousser la voiture,
Que casser la tête à ses passagers.

Another, whilst regretting Clemenceau, excuses Deschanel :—

Marianne, ne grondez pas Deschanel ;
Il est tout de même mieux que Mandel.
Gardez-vous votre courroux
Aux malheureux fous,
Qui envoient le Tigre planter ses choux.

These sarcasms reveal to us the popular point of view, one which at the first opportunity will change. To form a more mature judgment of M. Deschanel, we must consider his origin, his education, his speeches and his actions.

M. Deschanel is a *bourgeois* who has received a university education. He was born on February 13, 1856, at Schaerteck, a suburb of Brussels. His father, Emile Deschanel, a professor and littérateur who held opinions distinctly hostile to the Empire, quitted France after the coup d'état of December 2, 1851. After Sedan the Deschanel family returned to France.

A pupil of the Lycée Condorcet, at 17 years of age Paul Deschanel took his degree in Literature, and the following year his degree in Law.

He served his political apprenticeship as Secretary first to M. de Marcère and afterwards to Jules Simon. In 1885 he was elected Deputy for Eure-et-Loir, and still retains his seat. He has never been a member of any Cabinet. He has been, as we know, President of the Chamber since 1912, a post which he held previously in 1898, and again from 1899 to 1902.

Littérateur, historian, sociologist, in 1884 M. Deschanel entered the University of Heidelberg. Having there acquired a knowledge of Germany, an official mission in 1892 gave him a similar opportunity of studying the United States. After having collaborated in the editing of the *Journal des Débats* and of *Le Temps*, he published a large number of works, amongst others : *La Décentralisation*, *Figures de Femmes*, *Figures Littéraires*, *Les Intérêts Français dans le Pacifique*, *Orateurs et Hommes d'Etat*, *Politique Intérieure et Etrangère*, *La Republique Nouvelle*, *L'Organisation de la Démocratie*, and quite recently, *Gambetta*.

In 1899 he was admitted to the French Academy in the place of the journalist, Edward Hervé.

The son of a free-thinker and educated in the same principles, he married a practical Catholic, the daughter of M. René Brice, Deputy for Ille-et-Vilaine, a member of a highly respectable family. He has three children—a daughter 17 years of age and two sons, aged respectively fifteen and ten. The Elysée is thus brightened by the happy presence of the young.

Of medium stature and distinguished bearing, always faultlessly dressed, easy of approach, with ready smile and prompt affability, remarkable for elegance of diction, M. Deschanel is a man pleasing to the people. To please is his desire, and he succeeds in doing so. Always careful to avoid undue partisanship either of the Right or the Left, he has contrived both on the Right and the Left amongst men of every political and religious opinion to find friends. With consummate art he has ever tried to avoid becoming an actual member of any party and to maintain with regard to all his independence. He has kept fair with all men, if not with all ideas, and he has kept fair with himself. Thus it is that after 37 years of political life he still remains a new man. And a new man is a force ; he is in the best position for action.

Will he act ? And how ? His writings, his speeches, the part he has played in the Chamber : all very clearly reveal his mind on what are perhaps the three most important questions of the hour—Religion, Socialism, and our Foreign Policy.

From the point of view of religion.—M. Deschanel is the son of a free-thinker ; he is married to a Catholic ; he has voted for the separation of Church and State ; he has urged the maintenance of an Embassy at the Vatican. He has insisted on the separation of the Church and the State. Speaking in the Chamber on March 25, 1905, he said : " France is about to make a decisive experiment. The domain of conscience delivered from the domination of the government ; the State freed from religious quarrels—that is our ideal." In the following July he opposed Raiberti's motion calling for a second discussion on the projected law. He declared that this law was not framed for the purpose of persecution, nor dictated by hatred. He forgot that it ignored the rights of the Church, confiscated her property, and robbed the dead of the Masses provided for them by endowments.

On the other hand, six months earlier (October, 1904), and from patriotic motives, M. Deschanel defended the work of the Oriental Schools and protested against the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Holy See. " France," he said, " must concern herself

with the affairs of Central Europe. Now the influence of Rome in these affairs is naturally very great."

On the Social question.—For a long time M. Deschanel has made a stand against the socialists and the revolutionaries, at the same time declaring himself a determined advocate of Trade Unionism, of co-operation, of reciprocity. In July, 1894, he made a speech in the Chamber pressing for measures against the anarchists. His action in this matter led to a duel with Clemenceau in which he was wounded in the head.

On November 20, 1894, in answer to Jules Guesde, and on June 29, 1895, in answer to Jaurès, he criticised socialism. And again on December 26, 1896, at Carmaux, he repeated his criticism. Events have justified some of his words. "French socialists," he said, "are the allies of the German socialists. Now, German socialists have always declared that in the event of war with France they would bear arms against us."

In opposition to a Utopian and anti-patriotic socialism, he advocates free association, the trade union as the nucleus of a new labour organisation, the federation of co-operative enterprises.

"Therefore," he says in conclusion, "let us keep to the right idea which underlies the socialist movement, the idea of association, of solidarity. Let us reject the false idea of coercion, for coercion destroys the principle of solidarity. No: the future is not to coercive association; the future is to free association, to co-operation. Free association will destroy forced association." Such, briefly summed up, seems to be M. Deschanel's mental attitude towards the social question.

Equally plain is his foreign policy. He is against German unity, against the weakening of Austria; he is for friendship with England, but for the maintenance of the rights of France in the East. "Any weakening of Austria would weaken France," he said in the Chamber on November 19, 1903." Then, passing to England, he added:—

> A policy of hostility between the two great liberal powers, between the nation of the *Habeas Corpus* and the nation of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* would be a crime against civilisation, and a fatal anachronism also, analogous to that which under the Second Empire prepared the way, by the humiliation of Austria, for the victories of Prussia and the reverses of France.

And on January 30, as President of the Republic, he received the delegates of the Oriental Committee and addressed them thus:—

> Never for a moment, during my whole life, has the Orient been absent from my thoughts, nor, I may say, have I ceased to speak of it daily. In reality, the Mediterranean and the Orient together with the Rhine form the great dream of France and the two pivots of her foreign policy—the eastern frontiers on one side, on the other the Mediterranean and the Orient.

The Germans thoroughly understand that, although Clemenceau has gone, they have no reason to rejoice at the coming of M. Deschanel. If they had any illusions on the subject they were quickly dispelled by the first words of the new President.

At Versailles, in his reply to the congratulatory speech of M. Léon Bourgeois, M. Deschanel summed up his sentiments and his programme in these words :—

> Our hopes of 1918 have not been fully realised. To-day it is a question of overcoming the difficulties which harass us, by the strict execution of the Treaty of Versailles, by increasing our alliances and our friendships, by the union of all Frenchmen.

A short time before his election M. Deschanel, we are assured, said to a friend : " I have ten years of activity before me. I shall be able to show that there is work to be done at the Elysée." No one doubts that M. Deschanel has a clear idea of what he should do, and also a desire to do it. People only ask themselves : has he the necessary will-power, the will-power to face serious obstacles—even unpopularity ?

CHARLES BAUSSAN.

II.—Gabriele d'Annunzio.

THE name of Gabriele d'Annunzio has been so much before the public in recent times that the readers of STUDIES may be glad to have some information about him, all the more so as serenity of judgment and moderation of language have not always characterised the very different opinions emitted in his regard.

What is his real name ? Strange as it may seem we cannot tell whether it is Gabriele d'Annunzio or Gaetano Rapagnetta. Many of those who have written about him hold for the latter and accredit him with having assumed the name of the Angel of the Annunciation as the self-appointed announcer of good tidings to mankind. This view at all events accords with the poet's habit of clothing thoughts that are anything but religious in the most sacred language of Scripture. There are others, however, who hold that Gabriel d'Annunzio is no pseudonym but his real name.

He was born on the 12th of March, 1863, on board a ship in the Adriatic Sea near Pepara. He published his first work, *Prime vere*, at the age of fifteen, exhibiting in it already the tendencies which he would subsequently develop and accentuate more and more. It is pervaded all through by the crudest realism and Nietzschean symbolism. Never idle since the first attempt down to the present day, he has been presenting literary productions one after another with

marvellous rapidity to the public. We shall spare the reader the long list of these and content ourselves with saying that there is no class of literary composition which he has not tried, and with a charm of style to which must be ascribed the great havoc his works have wrought on souls.

Few indeed possess d'Annunzio's command of language and the artifices of style. But his prose, for all its rich garb and musical ring, is often empty of meaning, whilst the wealth of his bizarre and seventeenth-century imagery have made him justly likened to Marino. His work as a whole is morally corrupting ; for, as he himself tells us and is never weary of repeating in his books, he never follows an ideal which exalts human nature, but anxiously seeks out all that is most degrading in the depths of souls ruined by vice. Egotism and shameless sensuality sum up his literary work. Infatuated by the theories of Nietzsche, he is convinced that he is a superman at an infinite distance from all his fellow-mortals on whom (in his generosity !) he condescends to bestow from time to time a few crumbs that have fallen from his table. This sentiment is so rooted in his soul that, if he were not a d'Annunzio, his countrymen would have confined him before this in a mad-house. But what is insanity in a normal individual is considered genius in our hero. Hence the veneration with which many regard all his extravagances, extravagances which are in no way inferior to those of Gian Galeazzo Visconti or of the German prince who took it into his head that he was Lohengrin. It is this mad strain in his character which impelled him in the recent war to perform exploits not to be denied the epithet of courageous, but in which a calmer analysis shows that rashness also had its part.

But the worst side of the works of d'Annunzio is their sensuality ; and here it may be said without fear of error that no writer so far has ever been so uniquely intent on putting at the service of pornography all the results and aids of the various branches of science. There exist, indeed, books that are openly obscene and give vivid descriptions of human passions ; but such books, precisely because of the crudeness of their imagery, are more calculated to disgust than to allure souls that are not yet entirely corrupted. The books of d'Annunzio are not like these ; the evil is presented in all its reality but yet accompanied with such allurements that the poison makes its way into the soul in a manner that it will be afterwards extremely difficult to expel it. His characters differ from those of Zola only in this that they are more gorgeously dressed and—we may say without hesitation—still more corrupt ; yet the song of the siren entices incautious youth ; and conscienceless teachers are to be found who recommend d'Annunzio's books to their scholars. The fatal

result to religion and morality can be easily conceived, all the more so as even the holiest and purest subjects are contaminated by the filthy pen of this obscene writer.

At the outbreak of the European war d'Annunzio gave up the pen for the sword. He was one of the most enthusiastic war-propagandists and inflamed with his harangues spirits that were already sufficiently excited. Unfortunately in the discourses which he addressed to the populace he in no way checked his mad inclination to blaspheme the most sacred objects. The Italian Catholics still remember with horror and execration his shameful profanation of Our Lord's sermon on the Beatitudes in the speech he made at Quarto just before Italy entered the war. He has never abandoned this obsession of his. It may even be said that in no single discourse has he ever failed to travesty our sacred mysteries and turn them into ridicule.

As an aviator in active service he rapidly obtained decorations and promotion for his exploits. Indeed it cannot be denied that he more than once gave admirable examples of courage and daring. One of these cost him an eye. The following exploit gained him universal praise and admiration :—In an aerial expedition a bomb intended for the enemy, instead of falling, by some accident remained attached to the machine so that it seemed impossible to land without an explosion fatal alike to aviator and aeroplane. D'Annunzio perceived the danger, and with marvellous coolness so manœuvred as to reach the ground without accident. But he was made still more famous by his raid on Vienna (August 9, 1918). The enterprise was a bold one and full of risk, as it meant a flight of 500 miles in enemy country, but d'Annunzio brought it to a successful conclusion. His action too in sparing the Viennese, whom he treated to manifestoes instead of bombs, showed a chivalrous spirit and made an appeal to the noble-minded.

Thus he continued to acquire more and more celebrity, especially with the young, until in the complicated business of Fiume he was able to draw after him a considerable number. Is d'Annunzio to be praised or blamed for this episode ? Let posterity decide the difficult question. Certain it is at all events that, whatever the resultant good, examples of insubordination are always prejudicial and that d'Annunzio gave such an example. Was it love for Fiume or for his own glory that urged him on ? Here again a decisive answer is impossible ; but, considering how eaten up he is with megalomania, it cannot be thought unlikely that he did all this to exalt himself more and more in the esteem of his fellow-men.

A. P.

REVIEWS.

Biography.

FATHER WILLIAM DOYLE, S.J. 1873-1917. By Alfred O'Rahilly. With illustrations. London: Longmans. 1920. 9s. net.

It is no exaggeration to describe this work as one of the most remarkable spiritual biographies that have appeared in recent times. Professor O'Rahilly undertook, at his sister's suggestion, the preparation of what he expected to be a brief record of an edifying life crowned by a heroic death. But his plan was changed by the discovery of Father Doyle's intimate diaries. These journals reveal an inner life of extraordinary intensity and fervour.

The first sixteen years of his religious life, from his entry into the Novitiate in 1891 to his ordination in 1907, occupy a brief space in the volume. Exteriorly he was an excellent "scholastic," chiefly remarkable for the sunny charm of his manner, his almost invariable good-humour, and his apparent inability to resist a practical joke. Yet with all his brightness he was, in everything that mattered, the most reticent of men. "We never could quite make him out," the boys under him said, and the experience of his own companions was not very different.

The year of his "tertianship," 1907-8, following immediately after his ordination, was the turning point in his life. The Willie Doyle who was ordained in 1907 was the lad who had run up the steps of the novitiate in 1891, grown somewhat older and more mature; but it soon appeared to his religious brethren that it was a new Father Doyle, hitherto unknown to them, that returned from Belgium in 1908; a man of prayer in a degree far beyond the common, a missioner and spiritual director of extraordinary zeal and success. His influence with "hard cases" was wonderful. "I have not met a single refusal to come to the mission or to confession so far during my missionary career," he wrote once in a confidential letter. And certainly he tested his powers of winning souls to the utmost. "In one city he used during his mission to go down to the quays at midnight to meet ships due to arrive, and to induce the crews to come to the mission or even to go to

confession at once. And next morning he was out before six o'clock on the same apostolic errand, waylaying factory girls and mill-hands going to work."

His private diaries, intended for no eye but his Master's, reveal the secret of his success. From childhood onwards he had cherished the desire of martyrdom, and during the sixteen years preceding his ordination he had felt an inner call, sometimes faint and sometimes torturing in its intensity, to a life of complete union with his suffering Lord. During the "long retreat" of thirty days which is one of the exercises of the tertianship, his resolution was finally taken; thenceforth he had but one thought, Christ crucified. His inner life was lived at an astounding tension; he was like a man possessed—possessed by God. He was an unsparing taskmaster to himself. Carrying the practice of self-examination to lengths which would have been ruinous to souls of a different temper, he noted down the movements of his soul, the constantly increasing length and intensity of his prayer, his acts of self-denial ranging from the smallest (which he did not find the easiest, witness the numerous references to the question of sugarless tea) to heroic extravagances which send us back to the Lives of the Saints for parallels; his failures and relapses and renewals. He was tormented with the love of Jesus; straitened, like his Master, till his baptism be accomplished. Here is the account of a night during a mission in Glasgow, between two days of unremitting work: "I made the Holy Hour prostrate on the marble flags, and by moving from time to time I continued to get the full benefit of the cold. Then for two hours I made the Stations of the Cross, standing, kneeling, and prostrate, taking fourteen strokes of the discipline at each Station. For the rest of the night I remained kneeling before the Tabernacle, at intervals with arms outstretched, till I could bear the agony of this no longer."

"Sometimes, I might say nearly always, when speaking to people I am seized with an extraordinary desire to draw their hearts to God. . . When I go to see a hard, hopeless case, I cannot describe what happens exactly, but I seem to be able to lift up my heart like a cup and pour grace and the love of God upon that poor soul. I can *see* the result immediately, almost like the melting of snow."

The last two years of his life, spent at the Front, are vividly portrayed in the letters to his father reproduced in the volume. He was the same man in the trenches in Flanders as in the city slums or in the chapel at Rathfarnham. If we had only the records of his prayers and austerities to go by, we might easily suspect that he would

be inefficient and out of his element in an unspiritual environment. There could be no greater mistake. "There was no d—— nonsense about him," said one of his rough penitents. "We simply worshipped him," wrote a Belfast Orangeman after his death; "he did not know the meaning of fear, and he did not know what bigotry was." "He ought to get into Jim Larkin's shoes," was the admiring comment of his own 8th Dublins on his oratorical style.

Professor O'Rahilly deserves the thanks of every friend of Father Doyle, and especially of his religious brethren, for the admirable way in which he has performed his task. To appreciate such a life as this, to distinguish in it what is normal (not according to ordinary standards, but according to those of the saints), what is personal, and what is really excessive, the biographer needs a profound knowledge of the spiritual life in its higher forms, and in particular of the characteristic Ignatian ideals. I do not know of anyone in these countries who could be expected to surpass Professor O'Rahilly's achievement in these respects.

The book is admirably printed, and there is an excellent index

M. F. E.

JOHN REDMOND'S LAST YEARS. By Stephen Gwynn. London: Arnold. 1919. 16s. net.

Mr. Gwynn was well fitted to write this book, and has admirably discharged what must indeed have been a labour of love. Apart from an intimate acquaintance with John Redmond and personal knowledge of the events recorded, which qualifications are of supreme importance in such a work, he possesses a distinction of style, a lucidity of expression, and a breadth of vision which are united in few historians. The book is indeed far more than an account of John Redmond's last years; it is an accurate and vivid picture of the Irish political stage since Parnell died. Like Barry O'Brien's life of Parnell it will become a standard work for consultation by students of modern history. Much of it seems very remote and unreal now, but the tragedy of the last ten years has never been better told.

Mr. Gwynn has had access to Redmond's papers for the period beginning with the war; but he does not reveal much that is new or startling. Perhaps there was not much to reveal; for Redmond always worked in the open, and intrigue was foreign to his nature. We think Mr. Gwynn is absolutely right when he states that the fundamental blunder, the deep-seated cause, which undermined the force of Redmond's appeal for recruits was the Government's

refusal to recognise the National Volunteers and the failure to fulfil the promise held out in Mr. Asquith's Dublin speech. In this connection he gives a long letter from Mr. Redmond to Mr. Birrell dated September, 1914, in which the Irish leader unerringly indicates the result which followed from the Government's policy. Across the whole of this scene is thrown the forbidding shadow of Kitchener, the grim stupid Colossus, who cared nothing about Ireland save as a recruiting ground for his armies. Another letter from Redmond to Mr. Asquith, which Mr. Gwynn prints, shows that as early as November, 1915, Redmond warned the Prime Minister that the enforcement of conscription in Ireland was an impossibility.

Mr. Gwynn exposes, but not very clearly and with far too tender a pen, Mr. Lloyd George's gross breach of faith after the failure of the 1916 negotiations, a shameless proceeding which Mr. Tuohy of the *New York World* has recently most usefully exposed in a more trenchant manner. The facts were simple. Mr. Lloyd George undertook that, if the Cabinet refused to carry out the agreement arrived at between Redmond and Carson, he would resign. The Cabinet did refuse, but Mr. Lloyd George remained. It is sufficient to add that Mr. Asquith acquiesced in this dishonourable conduct, and it is some satisfaction to remember that he was himself the next victim. The failure of Woodrow Wilson was not essentially different from the failure of John Redmond. In both cases it was the failure of a gentleman to match himself against rogues. As one reads this book one realises more and more that the present state of Ireland is the direct fruit of English politicians' weakness and dishonesty.

"If the constitutional movement disappears," John Redmond declared three years ago (March 7th, 1917) in one of his last speeches in Parliament, "the Prime Minister will find himself face to face with the revolutionary movement, and he will have to govern Ireland with the naked sword." The prophecy, which was scoffed at when it was uttered, has since come true in every detail. It is difficult indeed now to reconstruct, even in imagination, the peaceful Ireland of 1912 and to remember the great meeting in O'Connell Street with Patrick Pearse, almost under the shadow of the General Post Office, telling the people: "I should think myself a traitor to my country if I did not answer the summons to this gathering, for it is clear to me that the Bill which we support to-day will be for the good of Ireland and that we shall be stronger with it than without it." And how few realised the depth of his pregnant conclusion: "Let the Gall understand that, if we are cheated once

more, there will be red war in Ireland." Nothing could be truer than Redmond's statement in his speech on the introduction of the Home Rule Bill (April 11, 1912) that those who still wished for separation were a very small section, and that, if Home Rule were granted, even that small section would disappear. Contrast that Ireland with the Ireland of 1920 held down by 60,000 bayonets.

Mr. Gwynn tells with a wealth of accurate detail the sordid story of the Convention. But the book is not all politics. His picture of Redmond's personality is not only accurate but illuminating. His simplicity, his reticence, his modesty, his lack of that dæmonic spirit which frightens as well as inspires and which made Parnell a great leader of men, his love of seclusion and privacy, are all admirably presented. "He detested always being lionised, and wanted always, when the public affair was over, to get away to his own quarters." It was typical of the man that he preferred the privacy of a personal room in a country hotel to the most generous private hospitality, and many were the magnates of English Liberalism it was necessary to smooth down on this account. "I am a crank on the question of staying with friends. I always stay at an hotel," he once wrote to the present reviewer. And no one knew better than he the disability which his temperament laid upon him. Yet Mr. Gwynn's verdict is just :—

> He was a great man, unlike others, cast in a mould of his own. Without the least affectation of unconventionality, and indeed under a formal appearance, he was profoundly unconventional. His tastes, whether in literature, in art, in the choice of society, in the choice of his own way of life, were utterly his own, unaffected by any standard but that which he himself established. Without subtlety of interpretation his judgments cut deep into the heart of things. You could not hear him speak, could not be in his presence, without feeling the weight of his personality.

When all is said and done, we may re-echo Mr. Gwynn's words that "no man gave more service for less pay than the Nationalist leader, and it was the harder because he was a man who liked comfort and had no ambition." He could have achieved great fortune and distinction at the Irish or English Bar. Had he followed the example of men like Lord Russell of Killowen, he could have reached the highest rewards of English politics ; but he lived and died a comparatively poor man, animated by the single purpose of leading his country to prosperity and freedom. Yet he knew, none better, the fate of his predecessors, O'Connell, Butt, Parnell—broken, beaten men, seeking refuge and peace in the grave. Such was also to be his lot. It is a lesson for the Irish leader of to-day, and perhaps of to-morrow, which he who runs may read.

JOHN J. HORGAN.

Classics.

THE ICHNEUTAE OF SOPHOCLES. Edited by Richard Johnson Walker. London: Burns and Oates. 1919. £3 3s.

The Ichneutae of the Athenian Tragedian Sophocles was edited for the first time in 1912 by A. S. Hunt from a Papyrus roll of the second century A.D. (Oxyrhynchus Pap. nr. 1174) excavated from the Egyptian sands in 1907. Previously to this, the three fragments extant had not revealed the subject-matter, which is none other than that treated of in the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes:* the theft of Apollo's oxen by the infant Hermes, the search of the Trackers (*Ichneutae*—a chorus of Satyrs), and the ultimate discovery. The play is unfortunately a torso—only some 16 columns are preserved containing the first 400 lines; but it has the distinction of being, with the *Cyclops* of Euripides, the only extant example of Attic Satyric Drama that has come down to us. The play, twice edited by Hunt, has been in addition handled by Willamowitz in *Die Spürhünde des Sophokles* (Berlin, 1913), by E. Diehl in *Supplementum Sophocleum* (Bonn, 1913), and more recently by A. C. Pearson in his masterly edition of *The Fragments of Sophocles* (1917).

The present three-guinea work of some 660 pages by Mr. R. J. Walker forms a substantial accretion to the literature that has grown about this new literary find. In it the author does not aim at an edition in the ordinary sense, but "rather at the bringing together of materials for the future use of others." This material, arranged in fourteen introductory chapters, is distributed over a space of some 500 pages. The text is accompanied by a parallel English translation (based on the "authorised" Version of the Bible). An apparatus criticus in Latin is appended below the Greek text and translation, but has to be supplemented by textual notes added at the end of the play in the vernacular. Finally, an *Appendix to Introductory Chapters* (pp. 567-626) contains the author's most ambitious efforts, where central problems connected with Greek Drama are attacked.

To retrace our steps for a more accurate characterisation—the first three of the Introductory Chapters deal with the plot of the *Ichneutae* and other kindred subjects. Chapter IV. deals with the style employed in the play, which Mr. Walker finds "as dissimilar from that of the Sophoclean Tragedies as the style employed by Euripides in the *Cyclops* is similar to that of the Euripidean Tragedies" (p. 26). This is an exaggeration—one can with equal justice aver that the lyrical portions at least of the *Cyclops* are as similar to

those of the Ichneutae as both are dissimilar to those of Tragedy (Sophoclean or Euripidean). In neither play is there elevation of style—therein precisely lies the differentia specifica of the Satyric *genre*—and the *Ichneutae* seems actually less colloquial than the *Cyclops*. In Chapter V. 120 pages are devoted to the Vocabulary of the Play. In spite of the Indices appended, it is often difficult to rescue the unoffending *voces* from the wealth of illustration and the frequently unnecessary discussions raised by a word in itself unimportant. The chapter on Stichometry raises interesting problems on the original length of the play and its relation, by no means a casual one, with the *Eurypylus*, a Tragedy of the same writer discovered at the same time, but in a far worse state of preservation. In Chapter XIV. a long and difficult excursus entitled *Cos* brings the reader into byways of Coan mythology. Here Mr. Walker is himself an ἰχνευτής and pursues many treacherous clues. Finally, with page 434, we reach Sophocles himself.

The Followers of the Footsteps is not, I think, the best rendering of the word Ἰχνευταί—better *The Trackers*, or some title like Willamowitz's *Spürhünde*. The mutilated state of the Papyrus in many places, especially in columns 16-18, which are mere fragments, gives plenty of scope for elegant Greek Versification. Mr. Walker avails himself too frequently of metrical licences, sparingly enough used in the *Ichneutae* as compared with the *Cyclops*, *e.g.*, verse 51 (an anapaest in the second foot), verse 56 (violation of Porson's canon), etc. The English rendering is dignified and simple, a trifle obscure perhaps in places—*e.g.* l. 15 (where the Greek, too, is highly problematic). With p. 567 begins the Appendix to Introductory Chapters, for which the author rightly claims "a careful and impartial consideration" (p. 626).

Unfortunately the reviewer has no space for an adequate appreciation of the writer's new synthesis and the principle on which it is based, viz., that the three tragic characters found in the Satyric Drama of the *Ichneutae* type (which he regards as an older and more complicated one than that found in the *Cyclops* of Euripides, where only one tragic character is met with) were drawn one from each of the three plays of the Tragic Trilogy with which the Satyric Drama was grouped for staging. If this be conceded, then the fourth play or Satyric Drama can afford a clue to the contents of the three preceding tragedies of the group. Mr. Walker proceeds to review all the known connected tetralogies of Aeschylus of which the Satyric plays concluding them present three or several tragic characters, and tries to fix the tetralogies at present undetermined,

and to assign the recorded Satyric Dramas of Aeschylus to tetralogies where not so assigned, as well as to bring together the rest of his plays into similar groups. A parallel method is applied to the few Sophoclean groups of plays recorded and an effort made by means of his three-actor theory to link the remaining Satyric Dramas to the Trilogies to which they were originally attached. Recalling Welcker's and Hermann's futile attempts at grouping together the Aeschylean Dramas, we must confess our scepticism for much contained in this theory, advocated though it be with astonishing learning and ingenuity.

The author deserves our best thanks for this excellent work, which everywhere betrays ripe scholarship as well as the indefatigable enthusiasm of the pioneer, who shrinks from no difficulty in the path of his enquiry. The book is well brought out, and reflects credit on publisher and printer alike. Misprints are happily to seek—p. 495, line 441, contains the only one we have noticed.

J. J. C.

THE LIFE AND REIGN OF THE EMPEROR LUCIUS SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS. By Maurice Platnauer, B.A., B.Litt. London: Milford. 1918. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS work bears traces of the conditions under which it was composed. Written between the years 1911 and 1914, and presented in the latter year as a thesis for the degree of Bachelor of Letters at Oxford, it was prepared for the press during the last year of war and published after the armistice. These facts account for much that is disappointing: a lack of finality in the judgments that are passed, and a distinct sense of hurried composition about the whole; yet Mr. Platnauer has done well in deciding to publish the book, such as it is. English scholarship has so long and so strangely neglected the whole period of the Roman Empire, that one welcomes any serious attempt to cover a limited portion of the field. And there is, unfortunately, little prospect that workers on this period of Roman history will be numerous in the immediate future. The study of Roman history in England has suffered many grievous losses during the last few years, and the dedication of this book reminds us that war has added the most brilliant of the rising generation, George Leonard Cheesman, to the list of those who will work no more.

Cheesman's influence is, we suspect, plainly discernible in the scope and character of Mr. Platnauer's book. The reign of Septimius Severus is one of the great epochs in the history of the Roman

Empire. In the sphere of administration the emperor left a permanent mark on almost every branch of the Roman civil service, and his military achievements are amongst the most remarkable of any Roman emperor. To both these features of his reign Mr. Platnauer does full justice ; four of the twelve chapters are devoted to an account of his numerous campaigns, and three to the various administrative reforms which must be ascribed to his energetic government. In all these questions we feel that Mr. Platnauer has had the advantage of being trained under a brilliant tutor, and is moreover thoroughly well versed in the mass of complicated evidence brought to light by modern German research. The quotation from Bacon which he prints in his preface—that Septimius Severus was "the ablest Emperor almost of all the liste"—is a remarkable instance of critical intuition, verified later by scientific research ; and we welcome the clear exposition of the facts which this book gives us.

Especially satisfactory are the first two chapters on the literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence as to the period. Here Mr. Platnauer is at his best, and the fifteen pages in which he discusses the many vexed problems connected with the authorship of the *Historia Augusta* are a very useful guide to the interminable controversy of the last 20 years. But it is only right to add that Mr. Platnauer has not succeeded in giving us an adequate study of the period as a whole. The reign of Severus is remarkable for a great revival of intellectual and moral energy which we can unfortunately only guess at owing to the paucity of our literary materials. Christianity was in the full tide of progress ; Irenaeus and Tertullian, perhaps also Minucius Felix, were writing in the West, Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the East. In Pagan literature the group of brilliant writers who circled round the Empress Julia Domna included Philostratus, Galen, Diogenes, Laertius and Aelian ; and Dio Cassius was writing his history in retirement from the court. Roman law was represented by Papinian, Ulpian and Paulus ; and the forces which were to result in the new school of Neo-Platonic philosophy were already at work. All these names are duly recorded by Mr. Platnauer in a very summary chapter ; but no attempt is made to interpret the great social movement of which these names are only the external symbol, and we notice with amazement that he makes no mention, either in bibliography or notes, of Professor Phillimore's brilliant essays on the period, contained in the introduction to his translation of Philostratus. Apparently Mr. Platnauer is more concerned with the red tape of Roman administration than with the life and thought

of the men who lived in that strangely modern period. And he fails no less completely to gain insight into the versatile character of the Emperor whose reign he studies. The ruler whose favourite motto was "Omnia fui, et nihil expedit," and who on his death-bed summed up his advice to his sons and heirs in the curt phrase, "Don't quarrel, pay your soldiers well and pay heed to no one else," deserves fuller and more sympathetic treatment than he has received in these pages.

A word is needed as to the cost of the book. Twelve-and-six for a slim volume of 200 pages, without maps and illustrations, is more than most people will care to pay for this volume. Germany last year was still able to bring out handsomely bound and illustrated volumes on classical subjects of nearly treble this size, for a price which in German money is little above the price of this book. If even the Clarendon Press cannot afford to keep their prices at a lower level, the outlook is gloomy for classical studies in England. A. G.

Fiction.

THE GAEL. By Edward E. Lysaght. Dublin: Maunsel. 1919. 6s. 6d. net.

SOMEBODY has described history as the essence of innumerable biographies—presumably the biographies of the men and women who have had a hand in the making of it. Now there is a class of men and women to whose lot it does not fall to make history, but whose little lives—unwritten biographies, if the term may pass—are moulded for better or for worse by history as it is made. It is the great class of the average citizen, the obscure, inarticulate οἱ πολλοί, whom the historian can deal with only in the lump. For them the events and movements of national importance have a personal importance, too, and, seen from this personal standpoint, the national events and movements take on a complexion which it is sometimes interesting to study.

To depict this complexion or aspect is the function of the novelist rather than of the historian, and, if we mistake not, this is the task Mr. Lysaght has set before him in *The Gael.* Here we have the events of twelve memorable years of Irish history, beginning with 1907, as reflected in the lives of a little group of average Irishmen and women. Of the events themselves and the movements that brought them to pass there is scarcely a word. We hear only the echo of them as it reaches a remote farm in the west. We have spoken of *average* Irishmen and women, and we think it

is part of the writer's purpose that his personages should be genuinely such. And indeed Con O'Hickie and his friends are neither heroes, nor freaks, nor etherealized types. The "hero," in particular, is in reality no hero: he is not even a model young man. He is in fact refreshingly free from pose, whether religious, moral, or national. His ideas for instance are neither logical nor consistent: they evolve, half unconsciously, under the mere pressure of events and the lessons of experience. And everybody who has lived the past twelve years in Ireland with his eye on the movements of the currents will know that the story of the fictitious Con O'Hickie's progress towards the full national faith is that of thousands of young Irishmen who are in no sense fictitious. The other personages of the story, if they are in a sense types, are normal and average types—the moderate nationalist, the conservative landlord, the Gaelic Leaguer, the pot-house politician, the popular curate, and so on. And most of them have enough individuality to give a human interest to the story.

Yet owing, perhaps, to the very success with which Mr. Lysaght has realised his purpose, if indeed his purpose be what we think it to be, his work seems to suffer from certain inevitable drawbacks. He has wished to paint things as they are, and he has succeeded; but it is the success rather of a well-developed photograph than of a painting. The result is a work of skill rather than a work of art. Our love of reality is satisfied, but there is something in most of us that makes us loth to forego the glamour, the poetry with which imagination clothes reality. Con's love affairs are depicted much as they might be by one of his elderly relatives. They are severely unromantic. Con and Peggy and Mary Lalor are certainly not without ideals, yet the reader finds himself wishing to be *made to see* in their lives the working of the genuine idealism that is giving a meaning and an exaltation to the lives of thousands of such ordinary men and women in the Ireland of to-day. The author seems over-careful to avoid satisfying any such desire. One cannot help wondering a little at this, for we knew Mr. Lysaght for a poet, before we knew him as a novelist. For these drawbacks, such as they are, there is abundant compensation—at least for those who have left behind them the romantic stage—in the absence of all ranting and false sentiment, and in the truthfulness to life of the glimpses of Irish scenery, of the fragments of talk overheard in field and haggard, of the sermon in the mountain chapel, and the rest. We are grateful to the author for the sincere enthusiasm with which he tells us the joy of life on the land, a joy which in Ireland is so often the joy of battle.

And here we touch what is, if we may say so, the speciality of *The Gael*—its personages view the national movement mainly from the standpoint of the land. The land is Con O'Hickie's first love, and it is through the land that he reaches the Nation. He comes to think nationally about "Rathcarrig." May there be found, in the years to come, an increasing number of Irishmen to follow the example of Con O'Hickie—and of his creator. S. J. B.

MOUNT MUSIC. By E. Œ Somerville and Martin Ross. London: Longmans. 1919. 7s. 6d. net.

In "Mount Music" we have something of a successor to "The Real Charlotte," that strange dark masterpiece of two writers who have given as much gaiety and fresh air to the world as any two persons in its history. I will confess now that returning to "The Real Charlotte" in my maturity its darkness depressed me so that I laid it down. Such masterpieces are for gay youth. Here in its successor is the darkness, but in a different form and very much more relieved. The two collaborators—for it was planned and part written in Martin Ross's lifetime—set out to grasp a very prickly nettle, with the best of intentions, I believe. The plot in short turns on a mixed marriage, and I truly believe that the intention of the writers was to deal far more hardly with the Church to which they belong than the Church to which the great majority of their fellow-countrymen and women belong. But somehow the good intention has gone astray. In the result we have on one side the Protestant gentry depicted with sympathy and charm, loved even when they are laughed at; on the other side there are the vulgar Catholics, quite incredibly vulgar, with very little relief. On the one hand is a delightful man-of-the-world parson—it is but fair to say that there is also a narrow-minded and ridiculous parson—on the other hand there are priests who will hardly be believed in outside Tunbridge Wells and such places where the Protestant Alliance flourishes. The love of the writers and their art are lavished on Christian, the Protestant heroine, while Larry, her cousin, who has been brought up a Catholic, is as indifferent as a young gentleman may be who remains a Catholic, yet is not altogether forgiven by his creators. Anyone who came to the reading of "Mount Music" in a state of ignorance about Ireland would believe that all the education, all the refinement, all the charm, all or nearly all the virtues, all the good-will, belonged to the Protestants; and that the Catholics were the baser sort in all possible ways. Yet some of the very oldest Irish

families, by which the oldest "planted" families are mushrooms of yesterday, still keep the faith of their fathers, still go to—to use Miss Somerville's phrase—"the chapel on the hill." I wonder by the way how any Catholic who knows better, or can influence those who do not, can tolerate the use of the belittling "chapel" for our churches: we are not Dissenters. The pity of it is that those two writers of genius know the Catholics only from outside, which is perhaps because the Catholic Celt is a secretive person, especially if he suspects lack of sympathy, and locks up his heart. There is nothing that can shed so ugly a colour over all the world as religious prejudice. Unfortunately it hangs yellow over this book, which is otherwise packed with beauty. If these writers knew from inside they would never believe that Father Green could be *mahout* to that elephant, the Big Doctor, touching him up with the *ankas* whenever he seemed to wander in a contrary direction from that the *mahout* intended. It is far more likely that the priest would be the one driven. I remember some one saying that the Pope had an easier task to govern the Catholics of the world than many an Irish parish priest to govern his flock.

And now to get away from polemics. Once again in "Mount Music" we have all the freshness and wildness and irresistible beauty of Irish country and the Irish atmosphere. We have the art and gaiety, the close observation of Irish whimsies and Irish ways, that renders them a miracle of faithfulness. There is the magical pen, the magical brush that creates us natural beauty. There are the breathless hunting chapters in which one hears the thud-thud of the horse's hooves, the beating of the rider's heart, the rush of the blood through the veins, the exhilaration, the smell of the morning, the look of the hounds, all one wagging tail, the anticipation, the joyous well-being—there are chapters in this book which must be classics. Then there is the intense sympathy with and observation of animals, so true and delightful that one has to pause and read the passage aloud. There are the exquisite bits of scenery:—

> It was dark in the wood: the fir trees towered in gloom above them; here and there in the deeps of the branches there was the stir of a wing as a pigeon settled to the nest; from behind the wood came a brief shrill bicker of starlings; all things besides these were mute, and in the silent dusk spirit was sensitive to spirit and the air was tense with the unspoken word.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> It was one of those gorgeous mornings of late September when everything is intense in colour and in sentiment. A bright white frost was melting in the first rays of the sun, to a silver dew that twinkled on grass and bush and twig. Now and then a beech leaf, prematurely gold, came spinning down in the still air: from high plains of Heaven a tiny gabble of music, cold and shrill and sweet, told of the songs of the larks at those heavenly gates. . . .

These passages of liquid music, and there are many of them, reveal the painter and the poet. The talk of the peasants is as delicious as ever. The characterization of the great number of figures that move in the story is as masterly as ever. "Mount Music" is a big book. It is not the first big book that is disfigured by the shadow of religious rancour. The melancholy thing is that the makers *meant* to be fair. They had depicted vulgar Protestant life in "The Real Charlotte." They might well ask in bewilderment why not vulgar Catholic life in "Mount Music"? Only that it is not true, or at least it is only partially true. There are vulgar Catholics as well as vulgar Protestants, but perhaps the odium theologicum is too strong in us all not to make it an agreeable task to scourge vulgarity in the other side.

Katharine Tynan.

THE GOLDEN BARQUE AND THE WEAVER'S GRAVE. By Seumas O'Kelly. Dublin: The Talbot Press. 1919. 3s. 6d. net.

THE LEPRECHAUN OF KILLMEEN. By Seumas O'Kelly. Dublin: Martin Lester. 1919. 2s. 6d. net

The short story has long been making good progress in Ireland. It is usually the short story of the impressionist class rather than of the narrative—the short story that looks back for its ancestor to Hawthorne rather than that which has found its most brilliant practitioner in "O. Henry." But there have been amongst us, as elsewhere, writers who have tried both kinds and some who have succeeded. With the fortunate ones we may fairly associate Seumas O'Kelly, whose regretted death a year ago was the immediate consequence of one of those acts of violence which have recently become ordinary incidents in the annals of this country, and who left behind him *The Golden Barque*, *The Weaver's Grave*, and *The Leprechaun of Killmeen*. His was a talent which had already manifested itself in unmistakable outlines and which might easily have reached more complete manifestation than even that which meets us in these posthumous tales and sketches.

The Golden Barque is an artistic rendering of midland-Irish scenery and rustic life as unfolded along placid canal-banks. Its central object is a canal barge, which we first see as it "loomed out of the haze . . . a long way off," when "The soft rose light that mounted the sky caught the boat and burnished it like dull gold," but which afterwards figures in more sordid surroundings; its varied personages are all connected with the slow life and work

of the barge. More grimly and persistently tragic is *The Weaver's Grave*, with its Poe-like mingling of grotesque and mortuary fancies. Hear the quarrel of the two old men in the cemetery :—

"If," said Cahir Bowes, "this be the grave of the weaver, what's Julia Rafferty doing in it? Answer me that, Meehaul Lynskey."

"I don't know what's she's doing in it, and, what's more, I don't care. And believe you my word, many a queer thing happened in Cloon na Morav that had no right to happen in it. Julia Rafferty, maybe, isn't the only one that is where she had no right to be."

"Maybe she isn't," said Cahir Bowes, "but it's there she is, anyhow, and I'm thinking it's there she's likely to stay."

"If she's in the weaver's grave," cried Meehaul Lynskey, "what I say is, out with her! . . . I'm no backslider when it comes to justice, and justice I'll see done among the living and the dead."

"Go ahead, then, me hearty fellow. If Julia herself is in the wrong place, somebody else must be in her own place, and you'll be following one rightment with another wrongment until in the end you'll go mad with the tangled dead men's wrongs. That's the end that's in store for you, Meehaul Lynskey."

And so on—towards a battle of decrepitude and a consummation wherein young blood asserts itself above the decays of old age and the churchyard. The author has an artist's consciousness of "that most subtle and powerful of all things, personality"; he knows (to quote other of his words) that "there is nothing more powerful, but nothing more delicate, in life than the values of individuality." And a secondary consequence of this consciousness and gift is that his pictures of non-human things and aspects have the beauty and vividness of individual life.

In *The Leprechaun of Killmeen* we find the author in a different and much lighter vein. A collection of yarns of the old Irish fireside style is put into the mouth of Tom Kelleher, the local seanachie, connected by an agreeable setting of the author's, and strung around the very elusive personality of a local leprechaun. The vigorous and combative Mary Ellen is the best of some engaging human figures in a book commendable to all manner of readers.

G. O'N.

DANSONS LA TROMPEUSE. Par Raymond Escholier. Paris: Grasset. 1919. 5 fr.

This is the story—if story it can be called, where there is no incident, but only the analysis of a frame of mind—of a woman athirst from her girlhood for beauty, movement, sympathy, and yet for whom life had held only hard reality and disappointment. A childish frame, and a childish, impulsive, artist nature. We assist at her pathetic struggle to preserve the illusion of youth and pros-

perity in the vast solitude of her impoverished country house; with a sharp-tongued, cynical marquis for her nearest neighbour, and exposed to all the *médisances* of a Pyrenean country town. Provincial life is sketched in a series of vivid scenes. Her only real solace is the somewhat rugged friendship of the *curé;* and he, poor man, has his own troubles and is transferred at the crucial moment to another parish. The whole analysis is delicate and poignant. M. R.

History.

THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF IRELAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By George O'Brien, D.Litt. Dublin: Maunsel. 1919. 10s. 6d. net.

"THERE is a marvellous change from the state of affairs [in Ireland] which old inhabitants can remember; buildings and farms are improving, each man striving to excel others in fair building and good furniture, and in husbanding and closing and improving their land." Were ever the great benefits conferred upon the Irish farmer by the Land Act, the Department and in fact constitutional agitation generally better put? And it is the testimony of a landlord, too, no less a person than the Earl of Cork. The citation however, is not dated 1910 or even 1914. It was written by the Great Earl of Cork in 1630. Things may change in Ireland, but phrases never. I have copied it from Mr. George O'Brien's new book *The Economic History of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century.* It describes the improvement that gradually comes in Irish economic affairs once the war of conquest in the sixteenth century is at an end.

The Irish in the first years of the 17th century are almost like Milton's angels prostrate on the fiery lake, the sixteenth century thunders still crashing in their ears. Everywhere desolation. But in an age of complete peace or rather complete exhaustion economically things improve. It is to Stafford's interest, when he comes, to better the condition of the kingdom, to revive the ancient and famous linen industry for example. Trade improves, even export trade. Men live fairly happily, if regretfully. Ireland has wonderful recuperative power. Effective confiscation is only in Ulster. Conquest is galling, but tolerable. Men are waiting. Then again, in 1641 comes a new war for freedom, and with it Cromwell and complete economic disaster. Throughout the century the English Parliament, not the king, is the enemy. An absolute monarch wishes for the prosperity of all his dominions, a parliament

of rich men, only for their own. At the end of the parliament period Ireland again lies prostrate and desolate, trade departs and the land is laid waste. With the Restoration, happy, normal life, economic life, revives. The Irish Catholic again gets a chance to live. There are some economic restraints—nothing to those that were imposed later on, but no penal laws. There is rest after the storm, and the country rapidly revives. Men have moderate contentment, if not freedom. Mr. O'Brien's tabulated figures—the work is written with the greatest technical skill—may help even the Macaulay-ridden mind of the modern educated Irishman to understand the desire for the restoration of the Stuarts, of which native Irish literature is so full down almost to the nineteenth century. The eighteenth century Irishman sighed for the *tempo felice* of the Stuarts, *nella miseria*. They remembered the comparative freedom and economic peace of the reigns of James and Charles and they remembered above all the just and far-seeing measures of the patriot parliament. But reaction won the day. The Stuarts were beaten. The English aristocracy triumphed, and the black tragedy of Irish martyrdom began.

This book is in a sense a sequel to the author's very successful work on the 18th century, if one can call the story of that which comes first in point of time a sequel. Notwithstanding a felon blow from one quarter, Mr. O'Brien's former work was a great success. And perhaps the only thing to be said against the present one, which follows the same plan, is that it is a sequel. Of course it is what it professes to be: an economist inevitably seeks truth by the dry way. There are no descriptions of wars and sieges, but there are statistics of corpses. The economic motive in politics of course replaces these quarrels of princes dear to the earlier historian. The remarkable thing about the relations of the two islands is how little the economic motive has changed. What Mr. O'Brien says of the relation of the English parliament to shipping, trade, and much else in the 17th century might be copied into the leading article of a newspaper at the present day without change. The great benefit which accrued to Ireland, according to the author, from the stoppage of the export cattle trade to England, is a matter that may at any moment become topical. This question is very fully discussed. Perhaps the greatest change that has come about, since the period under discussion, is the disappearance of Spain and France as factors in Irish trade. The book is full of facts, carefully tabulated, the source being given in every case. It will be a standard work, and every student of Irish economics must have it by him.

A. E. C.

LE CONCILE DU VATICAN. D'après des documents inédits. Par Leonard Mourret. Paris and Dublin: Bloud and Gay. 1919. 3s. 9d.

Official documents are neither expansive nor emotional. Studiously impersonal, they seem almost inhuman—something rather which is at once more and less than human. They reveal nothing of the men whose brains devised them, whose joint efforts welded them together. They set forth the results achieved, not the attempts to achieve them. On divergences of opinion, exchanges of ideas, concessions and compromises, they are silent. Ecclesiastical documents are no exception to this rule. The decisions and decrees of the great Councils, for instance, are easily accessible; but their cold precision gratifies our intelligence without firing our imagination. We do not find fault with such official restraint; but we desire a closer intimacy with the human beings who framed these great charters. We want to know what manner of men they were.

The Vatican Council, with which this book deals, is the most recent of the Church's Councils. It was an immensely imposing assembly—some 700 prelates from all parts of the world, drawn from every rank of society, trustees of the Church's interests in countries whose social and religious problems were infinitely varied. The prelates were entirely free to express their views, and expressed them with entire freedom. National or individual temperament helped to colour their mode of expression, and genial warmth was occasionally displayed. That there should be marked divergence of opinion from time to time is not surprising; and one is naturally curious to know how these difficulties were overcome.

In writing this book M. Mourret has had the advantage of consulting the diaries of M. Icard. This remarkable man—theologian at the Council and future Superior-General of Saint-Sulpice—seems to have possessed a genius for conciliation. He was (we gather) the confidant of the members of every shade of opinion; while his success in harmonising their differences was astonishing. Of all the doings of the Council, the mode of procedure and debate, the prominent persons who took part in it, the extra-Conciliar gatherings, the religious atmosphere of the period, the intrigues from without, the propagandist distortions of the Press, M. Mourret writes with authority. His work is intensely interesting and instructive. Some indications of a bias begotten of the recent war—natural perhaps in a Frenchman, undesirable in a historian—are regrettable.

J. M. Murphy.

THE CHARTERS OF THE CISTERCIAN ABBEY OF DUISKE IN THE COUNTY OF KILKENNY. Transcribed by Constance Mary Butler, and edited by John Henry Bernard, D.D., D.C.L., Archbishop of Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. 1919. 5s. net.

Dr. Bernard, sometime Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, and now Provost of Trinity College, is already well known for his careful studies in Irish Ecclesiastical History, and he has done good spade-work in editing ancient documents. The present volume, issued in the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, will enhance his reputation as a keen and discriminating student of Latin Charters in the case of the famous Abbey of Duiske, better known as Graig-na-managh, Co. Kilkenny. Lying for centuries in the muniment room of Kilkenny Castle, these pre-Reformation Charters have been meticulously transcribed by Lady Constance Butler, and are now edited in a scholarly fashion by Provost Bernard.

These documents give a good idea of the growth of a great Irish Cistercian Abbey from 1200 to 1400, and they also furnish an example of how an Abbey founded by an English nobleman became completely Irishised, or Hibernicised, in the course of the 14th century. Most commendable is the desire of the Editor to furnish notes helping to identify the numerous personal names and place names mentioned in the Charters. Taken all round, the personal identifications are tolerably good; yet, save for the learned notes supplied by Canon Carrigan, the historian of the diocese of Ossory, and copied with due acknowledgment from his monumental work, many lacunæ appear, while some of the suggested place names are utterly inconsistent with the topography of the locality. Occasionally, too, Dr. Bernard shows a non-acquaintance with Catholic authors of repute, and he writes completely from the English standpoint.

A few inaccuracies leap to the eye in the brief account of the founding of the Cistercian Order, and it is not correct to state that St. Mary's Abbey, Dublin, "had been affiliated to the Cistercian house of Savigny in Normandy as far back as 1139, a date prior to the foundation of Mellifont." As a matter of fact, Mellifont was the first or parent house of the Cistercian Monks in Ireland; it was founded in 1141, while St. Mary's, Dublin, did not become Cistercian till 1156. True it is that St. Mary's withdrew from the Benedictine reform of Tiron in 1139, and got incorporated with Savigny; but Savigny itself did not enter the Cistercian reform till 1147.

The identification of Rathkenny as "apparently in Co. Meath" is only surpassed by the suggestion that Rathsenboth, "in the barony of Forth," may be equated with "Templeshanbo in Co. Wexford." Surely the Provost must have been nodding, because both Rathkenny and Rathsenboth are distinctly stated in the charter to be in the barony of Forth, that is Forth, Co. Carlow. Again, "Kyllalsok" is certainly not "Kilmallock," while "Raywarren" is more likely Rathfarden than the suggested Raheengurreen. A more extraordinary blunder is the equation of "Vetus Monasterium" with "St. Mullins;" it is undoubtedly Sanvanister, or Old Abbey. And, very probably, John Dound, Abbot of Duiske in 1415, is John O'Dunne.

As can easily be imagined, Provost Bernard dismisses the story of the martyrdom of the Monks of Duiske, narrated by O'Sullivan Beare in 1629, and he makes considerable confusion in regard to the last Abbot. Yet, the martyrdom is also told by Father Malachy Hartry, O.Cist., who was Prior of Mothel (Co. Waterford) in 1625, whose testimony cannot be lightly set aside. Nor does the Provost allude to the titular Abbots of the 17th century, among whom may be mentioned Right Rev. Dr. Meagher, from 1680 to 1690.

Nevertheless the present volume is a distinct addition to Cartularies of Irish monastic houses, and will be found invaluable for the future edition of a revised *Monasticon Hibernicum.*

W. H. Grattan Flood.

THE CISTERCIANS IN YORKSHIRE. By J. S. Fletcher. London: S.P.C.K. 1919. 17s. 6d. net.

The author of this book modestly waives any claim to scholarship or to original research. With the help of authorities of whom he gives us a goodly list, he has provided in some 380 pages "a plain account, for the benefit of the average reader, of the rise of the Cistercian Order and of its establishment in Yorkshire; of the fortunes of the eight Yorkshire houses in poverty and in power; of the causes and events which led to their suppression; and of their actual fate in 1535-1540." It is clear that many grave and contentious problems have to be faced by the writer and reader of a history so comprehensive, and that the "plain account," even of a very fair-minded writer, will not easily succeed in confining itself to simply objective facts. Mr. Fletcher may be congratulated on having fairly overcome the difficulties of his task, and his book may be commended to all in search of information as to medieval monachism and its external working and history.

Of its internal spirit Mr. Fletcher has less to say and indeed hardly aspires to be the interpreter. In his general treatment he evidently aims at moderation—a laudable aim; but we think a certain fear of the bulk of his readers leads him to some injustice to his Cistercians. He judges them somewhat too exclusively from their own high standards.

To them and to medieval Christianity in general he is not quite fair in his accounts of serfdom and villeindom. He uses too recklessly big words like "slavery." There is no doubt at all that an Irish cottier under the landlord-system prevalent some fifty years ago was in a worse worldly position than a mediæval English serf. Nominally a free man, the supposed beneficiary of Magna Charta, Habeas Corpus, Petitions of Right, Whig Revolutions and Heaven knows what else, he was really a mere tenant-at-will whose entire means and place of livelihood were at the mercy of an irresponsible master. In England, after the Norman settlement, there was no instance of a serf being sold out or of his being evicted from his holding, except for some grave and manifest crime. A constant improvement in the conditions of the serfs went on. The great mass of the labouring classes had achieved comparative freedom before the Great Plague of 1348, and there is every reason to suppose that their condition was much bettered in the end by that calamity. The evidence for these facts, as well as the assertion of them, is to be found in such careful authorities as Thorold Rogers and Canon Brownlow (*Slavery and Serfdom in Europe*). The thirteenth-century villager was greatly better off than his successor at the beginning of the nineteenth century; and, as to the modern British town, "there is collected," writes Thorold Rogers, "a population in our great towns which equals in amount the whole of those who lived in England and Wales six centuries ago; but whose condition is more destitute, whose homes are more squalid, whose means are more uncertain, whose prospects are more hopeless, than those of the poorest serfs of the Middle Ages and the meanest drudges of the medieval cities." And if so much was done towards the elevation and sweetening of life, amid the wild moors of medieval Yorkshire, in days which lacked all the advantages lent by modern science and invention, the praise was mainly due to the paternal influence of the Cistercian and of his monastic emulators.

We have touched on but one point (doubtless an important one) of this book and its views. It is but fair to add that its topics of interest are manifold, and that there are few aspects of medieval life which it does not help to illuminate. G. O'N.

Poetry.

SONGS OF THE ISLAND QUEEN. By Peadar Mac Tomais. Dublin: The Talbot Press. 1919. 1*s.* net.

DAYS AND DESTINIES. By Peadar Mac Tomais. Dublin: Martin Lester. 1919. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

POEMS. By Mary Frances McHugh. Dublin: Martin Lester. 1919. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE THREE-ROCK ROAD. By H. L. Doak. Dublin: The Talbot Press. 1919. 2*s.* net.

IT is curious to observe how often the younger poet chooses to exercise his art on subjects that are morbid and gloomy in character. As the sorrow which he sings is born of fancy and not of experience, he is prone to indulge in a strained and violent form of expression in an effort to impart to it the reality which it lacks. Later in life he discovers that when sorrow takes us by the hand, or comes to sit at our fireside, we learn to speak of it with reverence and restraint. But youth will shout the story of its shadowy sorrows from the house tops.

This youthful morbidity and violence of expression is to be noticed in the poems of Peadar Mac Tomais, particularly in those grouped under the title *Songs of the Island Queen.* We discover a healthier and more natural tone in *Days and Destinies*, though the morbidity has not altogether disappeared. It is evident that the writer has not yet found himself—he is still in his prentice days. The faults to be observed in his work are the faults of youth and inexperience. He is often too easily satisfied, he will spoil his verse with a weak or halting line, he will make use of such a commonplace figure as "the moonbeams kissed the ocean's flood," he will allow himself to be obsessed by a word like *croon*, he will conclude the poem in which Amergin addresses his sword with a line like this:—*And at night the stars shall smile*,—in a word he will commit all the faults of which many a good poet was guilty in the days before he came into his kingdom.

In *Days and Destinies* we find evidence of development which is of good augury for the future. Compare for example the opening poem, *My Songs*, with *Songs of a Dreamer*, which introduces *Songs of the Island Queen.* The poem from which the collection takes its title also holds a promise that some day Peadar Mac Tomais will give us much better work than anything to be found in the two booklets before us.

Miss McHugh is a singer of sweet and natural charm. Her poems have a dainty, feminine quality which will please the reader,

and disarm the critic. Read for example *Voices* and *Of Violets* where this daintiness is manifest throughout. Her gift is lyrical rather than epic or dramatic, though she sometimes essays to sound a deeper note as in *Deirdre after Tara*, and *Ainnle and Ardan*. We meet with many happy lines as

> The wide moon tilts its brow against the trees (*Moonrise in April*).
> Upon the slope of south-turned mossy banks (*Of Violets*).

and the closing lines of *The Storm* which just fail of being perfect

> Fear is awakening fear,
> Startling each beast and each bird,
> Fear is at bay, and the deep
> Thunder is heard.

Miss McHugh's work is careful and restrained, and a delicate sense of the music of sounds is evident in her verse.

The writing of verse seems to be an accomplishment rather than a gift with Mr. Doak. He is not of those who write because they must, nor is he of the adventurers who will essay the farther seas and the lands unknown. His verses are light and casual as the flight of a butterfly, and their import is just as transient. Fancies and conceits of the lighter order abound; but his easy pleasant lines, which fall so gratefully on the ear, fail to awaken any deep emotion. Having read his verses through, we are conscious at the end of no more permanent impression than the lilt of these lines :—

> "Right on," he roared, "through Sandyford,
> And ne'er a turn at all,
> Till down you ride by Stepaside,
> And into Golden Ball."

A word of praise is due to Martin Lester Ltd. for the beautiful form, full of quiet dignity, in which they present to us *Days and Destinies* and the *Poems* of Miss McHugh. C. O'B.

THREE DAYS. By Rose Macaulay. London: Constable and Co. 1919. 2s. 6d. net.

Miss Macaulay, both as a prose-writer and a poet, has the *curiosa felicitas* which makes her appeal to the few and choice rather than the multitude. She is the novelist of the Happy Vagabond. A very brilliant and successful man introduced me to the work of Rose Macaulay with the "Lee Shore." He saw little in it, and it was a fair test. It is not likely that the man of worldly success could enter into Miss Macaulay's kingdom, which is reserved for the happy failures of this world. In my humble judgment Miss

Macaulay, both in prose and poetry, is set high among the writers of the day. I am inclined to think that her novels are very near the front rank. Yet how many people who subscribe to libraries are aware of her? And, of course, those who delight in Ethel M. Dell and Florence Barclay, to say nothing of the many unclean novelists, will have no use for Rose Macaulay. Her poetry is as rare and original as her prose: *curiosa felicitas* indeed. Not always may he who runs read, or at least understand. The poetry is often ghostly—shadows of twilight and the border world in it: it is a haunted chamber. Again she is quite of the world and the moment. The horror of the war looks through all these poems as through scared eyes; but the horror is never horrible. It never insists—it looks at you and flees. Pity, terror, compunction, all are here fixed into something beautiful by the magic and mystery of the poet. "Three Days" is a little book, but precious. It has all the writer's strange and distinguished qualities. The lover of poetry who does not know it already will thank us for sending him to it, as the lover of literature floundering between ineptitude and grossness at the circulating libraries will thank me for sending him or her to "The Lee Shore," to "Views and Vagabonds," to "The Furnace" and "Non-Combatants" and "What Not." Here, for an earnest of Rose Macaulay's poetical quality I quote the first poem in "Three Days," choosing that because it is a little less haunted than most of the others.

PICNIC.

(July, 1917.)

We lay and ate sweet hurt-berries
In the bracken of Hurt Wood;
Like a quire of singers singing low
The dark pines stood.

Behind us climbed the Surrey hills,
Wild, wild in greenery;
At our feet the downs of Sussex broke
To an unseen sea.

And life was bound in a still ring,
Drowsy and quiet and sweet . .
When heavily up the south-east wind
The great guns beat.

We did not wince, we did not weep,
We did not curse or pray;
We drowsily heard and someone said,
"They sound clear to-day."

We did not shake with pity or pain,
Or sicken, or blanch white.
We said: "If the wind's from over there
There'll be rain to-night."

Once pity we knew and rage we knew,
And pain we knew too well,
As we stared and peered dizzily
Through the gates of hell.

But now hell's gates are an old tale;
Remote the anguish seems;
The guns are muffled and far away,
Dreams within dreams.

And far and far are Flanders mud
And the pain of Picardy;
And the blood that runs there runs beyond
The wide, waste sea.

We are shut about by guarding walls,
We have built them lest we run
Mad, from dreaming of naked fear
And of black things done.

We are ringed all round by guarding walls,
So high they shut the view;
Not all the guns that shatter the world
Can quite break through.

Oh, guns of France, Oh, guns of France,
Be still, you crash in vain.
Heavily up the south wind throb
Dull dreams of pain.

Be still, be still, south wind, lest you,
Blowing, should bring the rain!
We'll lie very quiet on Hurt Hill
And sleep once again.

Oh, we'll lie quite still, nor listen, nor look,
While the earth's bounds reel and shake,
Lest, battered too long, our walls and we
Should break . . . should break.

KATHARINE TYNAN.

Studies in Literature.

IRELAND IN FICTION. By Stephen J. Brown, S.J. Dublin: Maunsel. 1919. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE labours of Hercules have for centuries compelled the admiration of mankind. One task in particular of that valiant toiler has—like one of the plagues of Egypt—stuck, so to speak, in the public imagination. It is scarcely necessary to mention that we refer to the sanitary endeavours of the Greek in the stables of Augeus. The work of Father Brown in the field of Ireland in Fiction has points of resemblance. True, Father Brown has not made it his primary undertaking to cleanse that largely dirt-laden meadow, yet in his efforts among the weeds and flowers which abound therein he has done not a little to classify and to separate.

In his preface Father Brown very properly states that "*. . . . the omission of books in the Irish language from a guide to Irish Fiction remains an anomaly, one of the many anomalies produced by the historic causes that have all but destroyed the Irish language as the living speech of Ireland,*" and thus disarms any criticism that might otherwise be offered from the view point of the Gaelic League. He has made it his business to print "a classified list of novels, tales, etc. (whether by Irish or foreign writers), bearing on Ireland—that is, depicting some phase or some episode of Irish history—and to append to each title a short descriptive note." The list comprises 1,713 items. We have heard of and read the Wisdom of Chesterton's Father Brown; but surely the industry of this Father Brown of ours is something unique. He has not alone made out a catalogue of books dealing with Ireland, but he has in most cases given us a "short descriptive note" of each book. In addition he gives, wherever possible, a very short account of the author. There are, moreover, Appendices containing much useful and varied information. We do not claim (for, after all, we are the merest of mortals) to have read each and every one of Father Brown's 1,713 items. But working with the help of the Index we have picked out what seemed attractive for one cause or another, and

the impression thus derived is that the greater part of fiction dealing with Ireland is singularly bad. The reason is not far to seek. No one seems able to write about Ireland without touching on politics. Until quite recently no one who hoped to sell his wares dared to treat Irish politics sympathetically. Few dare, even now, to be more than "sympathetic." These books were and still mostly are written for the British public, and the ears of Midas must be pleased.

It will readily be perceived that for an author like Father Brown to pronounce dispassionately on this mass of literature (if one may use such a term) was an undertaking far from easy. Any one who reads this volume must admit the fine impartiality and freedom from political or sectarian bias that he has shown. Very properly he has not hesitated to say of a book that it is bigotedly anti-Catholic or stupidly anti-Irish when such comments are called for. On the other hand, he does not denounce a book because its outlook is Protestant or pro-British. With far more exactness than most catalogues with which we are at all familiar, he appraises the work under review at its real worth and states in all fairness what it is like. Naturally enough one is guided by the classic precept *ex uno disce omnes*; one must assume the accuracy of Father Brown's judgment on the authors one has not read by the discernment he displays in regard to those that have been—may we say ?—more fortunate. His treatment of George Birmingham is typical. Despite certain natural antagonisms, his appreciation of Canon Hannay's work is unprejudiced and useful. We venture to submit that he might have waxed more enthusiastic over the sheer artistic and literary merit of George Moore. But Moore, it must be allowed, with all his unquestioned genius, is a little "strong" for orthodox Christians.

Being human we do not apologise for not going into further detail with regard to this truly monumental work. Mr. Tim Healy (it is reported) once said of Thom's Directory that it was an Arsenal of Irish facts. Father Brown's book may equally well be styled an Arsenal of Irish fiction. Indeed, one might not inaptly term it "Brown's Directory." One striking omission from its pages must be noted: no English History of Ireland is referred to therein.

W. D.

NEW VOICES: An Introduction to Contemporary Poetry. By Marguerite Wilkinson. New York: Macmillan. 1919. $2.

THIS book deserves a warm welcome. To quote a publisher's account of his own book is perhaps too daringly unconventional a

method of criticism, but really on this occasion the wrapper now before us provides an excellent account of the volume it encases.

> This book [it says] is both critical and friendly. It is for everybody who wishes to know what the poets of to-day are thinking and feeling, how they are saying what they think and feel, and why they say it in these ways. Contemporary craftsmanship and the several schools, radical and conservative, are thoughtfully discussed. A chapter for young craftsmen tells How Poems are Made. Nearly two hundred Poems by the best living poets of the English language . . . are quoted in full as illustrative material.

And the too-modest wrapper does not say anything (nor indeed do the title-pages or indexes) of the ten-or-so handsome photographic reproductions which illustrate the book. Truly, a violet among wrappers!

We do not mean to disparage the value of Miss Wilkinson's original work when we say that her gift to us most keenly appreciable is her double century of poetic illustrations, these being complete poems by the newest authors. For the bringing together of so much interesting matter we owe a large debt to her editorial energy as well as to her publisher's enterprise. What we mean even the uninitiated may understand from the fact that the prefatory "acknowledgments" to holders of copyrights occupy no less than eight closely-printed pages.

The hundred and fifty bards whose work, still sparkling with the dews of dawn, is thus sampled for us, will not (needless to say) represent everybody's notion of what is absolutely the best in recent poetry. America, naturally enough, gets a very strong lead. Ireland is not too largely advertised, with only W. B. Yeats, Lord Dunsany, Padraic Colum and James Stephens as her representatives. She may, of course, take some satisfaction in the recurrence of names like Daly, Driscoll, Cronyn, Joyce Kilmer and Patrick Orr; just as Germany may in her Sandburgs, Untermeyers, Oppenheims and Neihardts. From the English list we miss J. C. Squire, Hilaire Belloc, and others as notable. But the volume was never intended to present a complete anthology. Its quotations profess but to illuminate its author's literary theories and teachings, and, judged from this point of view, they must be pronounced generously abundant as well as apt.

Of the teaching and the theories we need say but little. They lie somewhat thick-tangled, as is the way with the books of young scholars, and to disentwine any of them with controversial intent would lead to undue lengthiness. They are well supported and not too dogmatically advanced. In general they stand in well

with good sense and moderation; among them we note the belief in work, in conscientiousness, in training, as important formative elements for the creative artist. In her literary preferences, however, Miss Wilkinson betrays, it must be admitted, a certain preference for the showy, violent, even blatant. We do not share all her admiration for Rachel Lindsay, or for Robert Frost, or for Amy Lowell, undeniable, even obtrusive, as their gifts are. We are more grateful for the share of attention given to such more delicate muses as those of Walter de la Mare, George Sterling, Witter Bynner. Among strong singers we note with pleasure the appearance of G. K. Chesterton, who adorns this book with his "Ballad of Lepanto"—a masterpiece less known than it deserves to be.

Miss Wilkinson is judicious on the burning topic of "free verse." She has shrewdly noted that "free verse" is really but seldom a natural utterance.

> They [the poets of free verse] have sometimes disregarded the fact that real emotion is the genesis of all good rhythm. When Amy Lowell and Ezra Pound fail to make good poems, in spite of their comprehensive knowledge of the art of poetry, it is quite probably because they are creating according to theory and not as result of genuine feeling.

That is well said. Poetry, in fact, is the language of imagination and passion speaking under control of the laws of beauty, and these laws will normally demand rhythmical and even metrical expression. "Rhythm," as De Quincey has well said, "is at once a cause of impassioned feeling, an ally of such feeling and a natural effect of it." And rhythm intensely felt and enjoyed will naturally regularize itself into metre.

On "Children and Poetry" our author is not so manifestly judicious. In one place she pronounces for the policy of presenting to children "masterpieces." As usually understood (we know something of it in this country) this policy is about as wise as that of endeavouring to fatten babies on beef and porter. Elsewhere, however, she seems to withdraw or to explain away this dangerous dogma.

Miss Wilkinson writes clearly and unaffectedly, sometimes with humour, sometimes with picturesque touches. Among trifling matters that have tripped us up may be noted a curious use on p. 30 of the expression "rich rhymes," and one or two spellings like "flambuoyant" On the whole, and for more than one reason, this book ought not to be overlooked by anyone curious about recent developments in English poetry.

G. O'N.

Social and Economic Science.

SCIENTIFIC FACTORY MANAGEMENT. By Arthur Du Pré Denning, M.Sc., Ph.D. London: Nisbet. 1919. Pp. 211. 12s. 6d. net.

EMPLOYMENT PSYCHOLOGY. By Henry C. Link, Ph.D. New York: Macmillan. 1919. Pp. 440. $2.50.

(1) I can most heartily recommend *Scientific Factory Management*, and I hope it will be widely read in this country not only by factory managers but by everyone interested in our industrial conditions. From a scientific point of view it is far indeed from perfect. It is rather a popular and enthusiastic treatment of a science than a scientific work itself; its purpose is propagandist rather then didactic. It sets forth in broad outline what Scientific Management means, and shows how it can be realised and what results it may be expected to achieve.

It is too early yet to try to appraise the full value of Scientific Management or to forecast its full effects on industry and industrial life. But even now this much can be safely predicted. No country can hope to compete successfully in international trade which does not keep well abreast of its competitors in the cultivation and application of the Science of Business Management. In America they have got past the experimental stage, and Scientific Management is practically established in many of its leading industries. And here is the danger for a country situated as ours is at present. We may soon wake up to the necessity of changing our old rule of thumb methods of industry. And how are we to do it? Scientific Management and all it connotes cannot be introduced at will. We must not imagine that we can simply borrow American methods whenever it suits our purpose. We must know the methods first, and that requires study and enterprise on the part of our business managers and of the younger men who aspire to be business managers in the near future. Nor is that all. The most up-to-date and efficient managers would be practically helpless in this respect, unless they were in a position to secure staffs of workers suitably graded and trained. In other words the ground has to be prepared and Scientific Management gradually developed. If therefore we hope to have our industries really efficient in the future, we must begin with our scientific organisation long in advance. The longer we postpone our preparation, the more is our initial disadvantage being increased.

And here is another difficulty we have to face. To lay the foundations of Scientific Management under modern capitalistic conditions requires capitalists of great resources, enterprise and imagination who will be prepared to incur expenses and wait for returns. But our capitalists, such as they are, are not of that stamp. As a rule their object is to exploit the country ; to get as much as they can out of it, and to get that much as quickly as possible. They will begin to adopt scientific methods just as soon as they realise that they can be made immediately profitable for themselves. We cannot expect much from them at the initial stages. The way must be through the enlightenment of public opinion, which with the co-operation of the most enlightened and far-seeing of our capitalists may gradually work the desirable transformation.

And what is being done to enlighten public opinion in this respect ? Very little so far ; but a beginning is being made. For instance a few weeks ago a most instructive lecture on " The Science of Employment, Welfare Organisation, and American Factory Efficiency in General " was delivered by Mr. Corby under the auspices of the Faculty of Commerce of the University College, Cork. That suggests how much could be done by public lectures, especially if they were promoted by the Universities, technical and secondary schools.

One final word by way of recommendation of Mr. Denning's book. We have reason to hope that we shall soon be in a position to shape our national destiny, and an immediate concern will be our industrial reconstruction. No one who considers how our industries are languishing, and the growing dangers which threaten them from labour conflicts, can be blind to the necessity of public concerted thought and action in the sphere of industry. Both labour and capital must learn to co-operate for mutual advantage on equitable terms. Therein to my mind consists the most valuable lesson of this book for us. Throughout, from the first page to the last, the necessity of such cordial, equitable co-operation is insisted on as an indispensable condition to any fruitful form of Scientific Management. Workers must be recognised as the partners rather than the servants of the employers.

(2) *Employment Psychology* affords an excellent example of what Scientific Management implies. It is strictly scientific, and deals with what may be one of the latest, but certainly not the least important of the phases of Scientific Management. It will appeal primarily to business organisers, although it is not without many useful lessons for the general reader. It is excellently planned

and written, and is throughout a model of lucid exposition. The opening chapter, which defines the nature and scope of Employment Psychology, is particularly interesting :—

> Psychology has been defined as the application of the scientific method to the actions of the mind in general. Employment Psychology, therefore, may be defined as the application of the scientific method to the mental actions concerned in employment (p. 13). What has psychology done to solve these problems (of securing the right man for the right place) and to introduce into the employment methods of to-day a more scientific procedure ? The greatest single contribution of scientific psychology to the solution of this problem has been the application of mental tests. A mental test is a device, similar to a measuring instrument in any of the sciences, by which certain mental activities can be accurately measured. The use of mental tests is not absolutely new or unfamiliar. All formal examinations may be regarded as coming under the general category of mental tests (p. 17). The object is to devise some objective impersonal standards by which candidates for different kinds of employment can be selected instead of the casual and often prejudiced individual judgments which obtained in the past. This [test] method is gradually making it possible to obtain standard measures of the mental qualities, measures which are infinitely more accurate than those used in the past (p. 18).

There follows a detailed treatment of the nature of these Psychological tests. They are most carefully considered and are themselves submitted to elaborate tests before being finally adopted. The author strongly insists, and I believe with justice, that the application of Employment Psychology is desirable no less in the interests of the workers than of the employers and general public.

J. K.

INFLATION. By J. Shield Nicholson, M.A., Sc.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. London : King. 1919. 3s. 6d. net.

THE PAPER POUND OF 1797-1821. A reprint of the Bullion Report. With an Introduction by Edwin Cannan, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of London. London : King. 1919. 6s.

Had Professor Nicholson wished, we know he could have given us a much more complete work on the very complicated problem of the currency situation in England. Seeing that he is probably the highest authority in England to-day on monetary questions, we regret that he has not done so. As it is, he has only treated one side of the question in the more or less popular lectures which form his book on *Inflation*. "The principal cause of the disorder of the body politic is the abuse of paper money." Hard thought, hard work,

hard cash, and—incidentally—hard times for a couple of million people, are the only means of "getting back to the King's highway and on to the Delectable Mountains" of national prosperity.

Professor Cannan, by reprinting an historical document of some importance, joins in the chorus of disapproval of the Government's action in issuing an excess of currency notes. He does so, we presume, in order to bring home to the members of the British Treasury the fact that their handling of the currency during the war is condemned out of their own "back numbers," so to speak; and also to let the public know that, if it only learnt from experience, it would not long tolerate a government which wielded "so potent an engine for surreptitiously fleecing its subjects as an inconvertible currency whether in its own hands or in those of a bank which it influences." A century ago, during the Napoleonic Wars, the Bank of England was charged with the task of issuing the necessary paper currency. The principles by which the Directors regulated their issue of notes was condemned by the Bullion Report of 1810. During the recent war the Government itself assumed the responsibility of issuing the paper currency. The principles by which the issue was regulated are still unknown, though it has been suggested that they are much the same as those on which "large scale production" is based. Professor Cannan, with some reason, thinks that "the experiment of entrusting what no community should entrust to any institution, the power of creating money without limit, to the Bank of England, compares very favourably with the modern plan of entrusting it to the Government itself."

But neither Professor Cannan nor Professor Nicholson deals with the arguments which have been put forward to prove that inflation has not occurred. Nor do they get down to the real cause of both inflation and "the present disorder in the body politic." Nor do they warn the public of what is going to happen in the transition back to the gold standard. Is not the real cause of the inflation the fact that both Government and people thought it expedient and necessary to live beyond their means for the last few years? "A certain man," wrote Epictetus long ago, "bought lettuce for one penny. Wouldst thou also eat lettuce? But fool thou art, if thou thinkst thou canst have thy penny *and* thy lettuce." And again, the public would be well advised to demand a clear and definite answer to the question "Cui bono?" before they allowed any more tinkering with the currency. Someone is going to make a fortune by the return to the gold standard. And if any one, why not the community as a whole?

E. J. C

THE HOUSING OF THE UNSKILLED WAGE EARNER. By Edith Elmer Wood. New York: Macmillan. 1919. $2.25.

THIS is a survey, carefully and clearly arranged, of what has been done in various countries for the housing of the working classes, special attention being given to the United States. The general conclusion which imposes itself throughout the book, and which Mrs. Wood constantly emphasises is that the function of housing the poor should not be left to private enterprise, but should be considered as a matter of vital and immediate consequence for the State. The need of such housing is too vast and pervasive for any lesser body than the one whose duty it is to provide for the welfare of *all* the citizens.

Private enterprise in this matter has accomplished little in comparison with the needs of the community, and that little has been of advantage mostly by way of experiment and by way of setting a proper headline for more comprehensive schemes. Only a few large scale employers (and it is only such who have done anything worth speaking of) have housed their workers, a small proportion and not the most destitute of the working class. In this connection it is interesting to note that the United States, the land of colossal philanthropic donations, has nothing comparable to the enterprises of Bournville or Essen. In any case the housing of workpeople by their employers, though sometimes inspired by genuine philanthropy, is open to serious criticism as deepening the lamentable division which marks off society into two classes, a class of capitalist lords and a class of dependents. It is easy to sympathise with the indignation of the mill-hand, quoted in this book, who refers to his employer thus: "We work in *his* mill. We live in *his* houses. Our children go to *his* school. On Sunday we go to hear *his* preacher. . . And when we die we are buried in *his* cemetery."

The formation of stock companies for the housing of the working classes seemed at one time to promise much. They offered to their shareholders the comfortable feeling of philanthropic action and the grosser attraction of 5 per cent. interest on the money invested in them. As a fact, however, they have achieved little, and that little has hardly ever been done for the poorer classes of the community.

Having established the utter futility of expecting much from any form of private enterprise, Mrs. Wood examines the various ways in which the States of certain countries have dealt with the problem. These are roughly four: (1) Direct State or Municipal

housing; (2) Loans to non-commercial housing companies; (3) Loans to individual workers; (4) Tax-exemptions for houses of approved standard and rental. All of these ways are, she argues, suitable, and the first three are even necessary for inclusion in any complete housing policy for the United States.

The book is a very useful one for those interested in the housing question in Ireland. Of the Irish housing question she treats briefly, beginning with the remark: "Ireland . . . presents conditions and methods so exceptional as to require separate treatment. The example of Ireland is chiefly of interest to us as something to be avoided." L. McK.

Studies in National Character.

THE SOUL OF IRELAND. By W. J. Lockington, S.J. London: Harding and More. 1919. 6s. net.

IT may seem an ungracious thing to find fault with so kindly a critic as Fr. Lockington. Yet perhaps he will pardon us when he understands that the only fault we find is that he causes us to blush. We wonder can we be really as good as he paints us. And if he will reply that this only springs from humility and is merely another proof of his main thesis that Ireland is still the *Insula Sanctorum*, it is hardly for Irishmen to complain. We can but hide our blushes as best we may and hope in our hearts that we are more worthy of his eulogies than we feel.

Doubtless, also, it is fitting that once in a way the better side of Irish life should find a panegyrist outside Ireland. For of late enough and more than enough has been said on the other side. Our amiable neighbours across the Irish sea have felt constrained to play the *advocatus diaboli* before the Rota of the world's opinion and show how seriously we fall short of their own moral standards. We can take it, then, that we shall not be canonised too hastily and that Fleet Street will provide the corrective to this generous tribute of a stranger from New Zealand, who has stood upon many a broken arch of Irish churches and seen in the moss grown ruins the symbol of our past and in the unbroken arches that have arisen and multiplied about them the pledge of our future. For this about expresses the burden of the book.

It does not purport to be a critical analysis of all the varied aspects of our national character. It does not dwell on the faults at all. Fr. Lockington seems to think they have been sufficiently emphasised. He writes: "To those who say that I have spoken mainly of the bright side of Irish life and have left untouched

its failings, I answer that to say that the Irish have faults is only to say that they are human, and that whatever faults may be theirs have been dilated upon by writers innumerable, and magnified beyond all truth and justice." Finding fault is not congenial to him, and his chivalry shrinks from casting stones at the unfortunate woman taken in the terrible crime of desiring to be free in soul and body, and of refusing to burn incense on the shrine of Cæsar. For he realises that, stripped of false pleas, this is the indictment. For him, as for another Australasian, Ireland is

> The loved, the romantic
> Island that sleeps on the moaning Atlantic.

And the romance is, in his eyes, primarily the unswerving loyalty of the Irish race to faith and fatherland. He writes as a confessed lover. "She is a land that to know is to love—for he that knows Ireland always loses his heart to her." There are those who do not love her, there are even those who hate her with the implacable hatred of the guilty for their victim—*humanum est odisse quem laeseris.* Such will not like this book, they may even style it a "rhapsody," like the *Spectator.* But for the many who share his affection or preserve as yet an open mind it should prove pleasant reading, and will give them the clue to the labyrinth of Irish history.

G.

LA CIVILISATION FRANCAISE. Guide pour l'explication des choses de France. Publié chaque mois à Paris par un comité d'hommes d'étude. Paris: 11 Rue Saint-Augustin. 1919. Nos. 1-3. 2 fr. le numéro.

As has been often remarked, the world war that began in 1914 and has not yet ended was waged not only on the field of battle. While millions of men slaughtered each other with modern engines of destruction, thousands of other men were wielding a weapon once said to be mightier than the sword. This other war of words, for such it was, took many forms. There was the struggle to fix the rights and wrongs of the conflict, to fasten the blame of it upon the enemy. Masses of documentary evidence were hurled as by heavy ordnance, while the journalist worked his machine-gun and the pamphleteer cast his hand grenades. There was also the vast effort to sow disunion in the ranks of the enemy and raise up for him domestic foes. And there was the persistent endeavour of both sides to capture the sympathy of neutrals.

But in all the belligerent countries there were writers who looked beyond the passionate controversies of the hour. They saw, or seemed to see, deeper into the heart of the conflict. They believed that two (or more) civilisations, two (or more) interpretations of

the world were at issue. To place this issue in its true light and give it its true perspective more was needed than to make here and there a good debating point or score a lucky hit. A more comprehensive apologia was called for and accordingly the thinkers of each belligerent nation set themselves to lay before the world their country's ideals, its "soul."

Whether such a pre-occupation be the origin of the present publication or merely the occasion for its appearance we do not pretend to determine. Certainly, if its object be the same as that of other French propagandist publications for the foreigner (for instance, the Bulletins of the Alliance Française), its method of attaining that object is very different. But let us allow the editors of *La Civilisation Française* to state the aim and spirit of their publication. We translate :—

> We wish to help other peoples to form an accurate idea of the French people, and also to help the French people to know itself. We have thought, in the first instance, of the needs of those who propagate our language and our arts in foreign countries.

This is the aim, and the spirit of the enterprise is thus described :

> To characterise [or should we say, "portray the character of "] France with truth ; nothing more. Let it not be thought that we are going to glorify our country ; nor even to appraise it. Our whole object is to make it known—as being an interesting subject of study ;—then to explain it—as being a difficult subject.

Such words seem to hold the promise of an objectivity, an impartiality which might be to some extent realisable were there question merely of facts, but which when explanation or interpretation is in question, is well-nigh beyond the powers of man. And in point of fact this publication, though occasionally it provides facts and concrete information, is much more interested in ideas. It is more interested in the philosophy of history than in its events, in the French ideal that runs through French literature rather than in books and authors, in political and religious ideals rather than in statistics. It is surely obvious that the discussion of such ideas must be coloured by the religious, philosophical, political convictions of the writers. The Protestant writer (and several of the editors are Protestant) who touches on religious matters does so inevitably in a Protestant spirit. Who will blame him ? Some of the articles have a Catholic flavour, others are obviously non-Catholic,[1] though even in the contributions of those whom we know to be free-thinkers, we have not noticed any attack on religion. Again, the writers who have occasion to touch on the matter speak of the Revolution (*our* Revolution) as a thing long since

[1] In one the *Loi Falloux* is described as "une arme de combat contre la République (p. 194). Catholic historians are omitted from the Bibliography.

taken to the bosom of every Frenchman. The foreigner is told that Louis XIV. and Napoleon must be absolutely set apart from the true French people. In other words, many of the contributions, including most certainly the biographies, are inevitably "*tendancieux.*"

We say *inevitably*, and therein lies the drawback of such publications for all who are unacquainted with the antecedents of the writers. The innocent foreign reader fondly imagines that he is looking at this or that aspect of France in the simple light of day, whereas he is looking through the coloured spectacles of one of the well-meaning professors who have here undertaken to interpret France for him. If the political and religious colour of the committee who have undertaken his guidance were uniform and were known to him, all might yet be well. A quite similar publication that appeared some months ago calls itself frankly *La France Catholique.* But this committee rejoices in the variety of its colours and yet, for obvious reasons, does not tell us just what those colours are.

Such an important reservation may seem equivalent to a disparagement of the entire undertaking. Not so. There are many contributions to which, because of their very subjects, our reservation does not apply. The first of its aims—to make France known to itself and to other nations—seems, by these contributions at least, to be admirably attained. Whether the second aim, to explain France, is equally well attained is a question about which we are not without misgivings. Perhaps the mention of some of the subjects dealt with in the first three numbers may justify these misgivings in the eyes of some of our readers. Here are a few of the titles :—French Rationalism, The French Ideal in Literature, The Politics of Labour in France, The Revolution of 1848, French History before Montesquieu and Voltaire, Vocabulary of Philosophy, etc., etc. On the other hand there are articles on French water-power, the metric system, French reconstruction and other matters of the kind. And thus in these 80 pages that are to appear every month will be found a large body of valuable information about things French. S. J. B.

L'AME DE FRANCE. Par Edward Montier. Paris and Dublin : Bloud et Gay. 1919. 3s. 9d.

LA CIVILISATION FRANÇAISE. Par Victor Giraud. Paris : Hachette. 1917. 1 fr.

THE first of these two books is a song of love to France. "The generous heart . . . takes wing in the wake of love as it passes, like the bird swallowed up in a sunbeam. . . Love of country is of like nature ; it enflames, subdues, transports. . .

Sometimes it happens that in analysing one's love, one kills it. . . But when it is love of country, and that country France, there is no fear that contemplation will bring disenchantment." These sentences from the preface give exactly the note of the book. The loving analysis is full and subtle. It is, therefore, suggestive, and helps the reader to disengage the results of his own observations. But the same acute sensibility which stirs love to passion, allows hatred to warp the judgment. No country could be so utterly devoid of merit as almost in every chapter to furnish a black foil for the bright qualities—all undeniable in their degree—of beloved France. Needless to say the country painted so unfavourably is Germany.

M. Giraud's treatise, which won the *prix d'éloquence* at the *Académie française* in 1916, is more reasoned. It is stronger and deeper in its vigorous concentration. And it is singularly objective. From a Frenchman in 1916 it would be inhuman to expect no note of violence in speaking of Germany. Even if it be an exaggeration to state "that along with France civilisation itself had been saved by the French army," it is nevertheless true that many of the fairest flowers of Western civilisation have blown in France. The chapters on literature, philosophy, and religion are full of suggestive ideas. The essentially *human*—in Pope's sense, that the proper study of mankind is man—and social character of French literature is brought out. The same note is characteristic of French philosophy: "To be human, as completely, as deeply as possible; not to force, not to strain human nature; not to degrade it either; to respect it in oneself and others; to accept its limitations, to develop its powers and harmonise its contrasts: such has been from all time the ideal adopted and propagated by French philosophy. . ." (p. 27). This common sense, this sense of reality, sense of proportion, does indeed—as far as one can generalise in matters so elusive—seem to be the prevailing note of French thought and character. That is why—as M. Giraud says further on—the robust Catholicism of a Bossuet is so germane to the French mind. That also tends to explain the remarkable recurring conversions in every period of French history.

The last chapter, on the rôle of France in history, is the least satisfactory. It reads like a not quite successful piece of special pleading. It is, again, true that the Frenchman is easily fired by ideas and fights for them bravely; and that at certain periods whole masses shared the same enthusiasm. Nevertheless, how can the march of history in any country—wars, conquests, revolutions—be shown to have been guided by an ideal? Is it not a mere metaphor to speak so? And if good on the whole is stimulated by evil, does that justify the evil? M. R.

Religion.

THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES OF ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. Translated, with *Directorium* and Commentary, by W. H. Longridge, M.A., S.J.E. London: Robert Scott. 1919. 9s. net.

This is a very remarkable book, although its notable qualities are not such as to call for lengthy notice. It is a study by an Anglican clergyman of the oft-commented Exercises of St. Ignatius—a study conceived in a reverent spirit of discipleship, inspired by the best traditions of Catholic commentators, and carried out in a manner which renders it a valuable addition to our shelf of books on the Exercises. The author shows himself in various ways well qualified for his high task. He has not spared pains in acquainting himself with his subject, he has studied and balanced the views and suggestions of his predecessors, he has remarks of his own which show an enlightened and equitable judgment. Of these more personal remarks let us quote two samples: they will illustrate in various ways the *ethos* of the book:—

> From all that has been said in the notes upon the Exercises of the first week it will be seen how carefully St. Ignatius seeks, even when dealing with the most awful subjects, to inspire us with hope, and gratitude towards God our Lord, never representing Him as an exacting and severe Judge, but always as merciful and long suffering. This is especially noticeable in the colloquies at the end of every meditation. In every case it is the love, the long suffering, the pity and mercy of God and our Lord which we are especially directed to contemplate and to which we are encouraged to address ourselves. Nowhere do we find a single harsh word which might lessen our confidence in the love of God. Nowhere is the thought of sin and its eternal punishment presented in such a way as to cast us down in despair, but always in such a way as to awaken a grateful acknowledgment of God's mercy in having spared us hitherto, and to inspire us with hope and resolution of amendment. It is much to be wished that all directors in giving the Exercises, as well as in preaching and in the confessional, would bear this in mind. . . . .

The second concerns the detailed method of making the particular examination of conscience which is given by St. Ignatius:—

> As an example of the breadth of mind and liberty of spirit which were so characteristic of S. Ignatius and of the first Fathers of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Gagliardi, one of the earliest commentators on the Exercises, says:—"This examination is very important for all, but it is otherwise in the case of that strict method which consists in marking a series of dots in columns. This is useless and even harmful to the scrupulous and those who are lacking in memory and imagination: let them perform this examination in another way."

G. O'N.

Books also received:

JACOB H. ARNOLD ... ... Farm Management. (Macmillan, $1.25).
J. M. BENSON ... ... Poems. (Daniel, 2*s*.)
T. W. CRAFER, D.D. ... ... Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes. (S.P.C.K., 7*s*.)
MICHAEL CRONIN, D.D. ... Science of Ethics, Vol. 1. 2nd Ed. (Gill, 21*s*.)
FRED B. FISHER ... ... India's Silent Revolution. (Macmillan, $1.50
F. A. FORBES ... ... St. Athanasius. (Washbourne, 2*s*. 6*d*.).
St. Vincent de Paul. (Washbourne, 2*s* 6*d*.)

CONOR GALWAY ... ... Towards the Dawn. (Talbot Press, 6*s* 9*d*.).
CARDINAL GASQUET ... ... A History of the English College, Rome. (Longmans, 15*s*.).

FRANK B. GILBRETH ... ... Motion Study for the Handicapped. (Routledge, 8*s*. 6*d*.).

CHARLES GORE, D.D. ... Roman Catholic Claims. (Longmans, 4*s*.).
JOSEPH GUINAN, P.P. ... Months and Days. Their Silent Lessons. (C.T.S.I., 1*s*. 9*d*.).

J. L. HAMMOND ... ... The Skilled Labourer, 1760–1832. (Longmans, 12*s*. 6*d*.).

F. H. HAYWARD, D.Litt. ... A First Book of School Celebrations. (King, 5*s*.)
M. R. JAMES, D.Litt. ... The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament. (S.P.C.K., 5*s*. 6*d*.).
The Wanderings and Homes of Manuscripts. (S.P.C.K., 2*s*.).

S. C. JOHNSON, D.Sc. ... Pastimes for the Native Lover. (Holden and Hardingham, 1*s*.).

ROBERT KANE, S.J. ... Worth. Lectures. (Longmans, 6*s*. 6*d*.).
ETHNA KAVANAGH ... ... The Priest of Isis & other Poems. (Long, 2*s*. 6*d*.).
JOHN M. KEYNES ... ... The Economic Consequences of the Peace. (Macmillan, 8*s*. 8*d*.).

C. J. KICKHAM ... ... The Eagle of Garryroe. (Martin Lester, 3*s*. 6*d*.).
WILLIAM KIDDIER ... ... The Painter's Voice. (Fifield, 2*s*. 6*d*.).
MARIAN LOCKYER ... ... Poems. (Morland, 1*s*. 6*d*.).
J. BERNARD MCCARTHY ... The Shadow of the Rose. (Talbot Press, 1*s*.).
BRINSLEY MACNAMARA ... The Clanking of Chains. (Maunsel, 6*s*. 6*d*.).
ABBOT MARMION, O.S.B. ... Le Christ, Vie des Ames. (Maredsous, 6fr. 50).
Le Christ dans ses Mystères. (*Ibid*., 6fr. 50).
C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J. ... Upon God's Holy Hills. (Washbourne, 3*s*. 6*d*.).
ROBERT H. MURRAY, D.Litt. ... Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration. (S.P.C.K., 25*s*.).

H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. ... Christian Inscriptions. (S.P.C.K., 1*s*.).
WILLIAM O'BRIEN ... ... When we were Boys. (Maunsel, 1*s*. 6*d*.).
EIMAR O'DUFFY ... The Wasted Island. (Martin Lester, 7*s*.).
GEORGE O'NEILL, S.J. ... Essays on Poetry. (Talbot Press, 5*s*.).
M. J. PHELAN, S.J. ... ... From Dust to Glory. (Longmans, 5*s*.).
J. S. PHILLIMORE, M.A. ... The Revival of Criticism. (Blackwell, 1*s*. 6*d*.).
HERBERT MOORE PIM ... Songs from an Ulster Valley. (G. Richards, 3*s*. 6*d*.)
A Short History of Celtic Philosophy. (Dundalgan Press, 7*s*. 6*d*.).

CHARLES PLATER, S.J. ... Catholic Soldiers. (Longmans, 5*s*.).
R. POPE-HENNESSY ... ... The Irish Dominion. A Method of Approach to a Settlement. (Nisbet, 6*d*.).

A. M. RAINBIRD ... ... Poems. (Morland, 1*s*. 5*d*.).
M. A. RATHKYLE ... ... Farewell to Garrymore. (Talbot Press, 3*s*. 6*d*.).
L. G. REDMOND-HOWARD ... The Story of the Great War (Talbot Press, 3*s*.).
D. RIORDAN, C.C. ... ... A Patriot Priest. (Gill, 2*s*. 6*d*.).
OSWALD ST. CLAIR ... ... Physiology of Credit and of Money. (King, 5*s*.).
MOTHER ST. PAUL ... ... Dona Christi. Meditations. (Longmans, 5*s*.).
E. W. SHANAHAN, D.Sc. ... Animal Food-Stuffs. (Routledge, 10*s*. 6*d*.).
CHARLES SIMMONDS ... ... Alcohol. (Macmillan, 21*s*.).
A. SOUTER, D.Litt. ... ... Tertullian against Praxeas. (S.P.C.K., 5*s*).
Hints on the Study of Latin. (S.P.C.K., 8*d*.).

H. F. STEWART, D.D. ... Les Lettres Provinciales de Blaise Pascal. (Longmans, 8*s*. 6*d*.).

MICHAEL TIERNEY, M.A. ... Education in a Free Ireland. (Lester, 3*s*.).
C. TIGAR, S.J. ... ... Elements of Housing. (C. S. G., 6*d*.).
PADRAIC UI CONAIRE ... An Crann Geagach. (Martin Lester, 3*s*. 6*d*.).
M. DE P. WEBB ... ... Britain Victorious. (King, 3*s*. 6*d*.).
W. B. YEATS ... ... Poems, 2nd Ed. (Fisher Unwin, 10*s*. 6*d*.).

(*The prices of all books in this list are net.*)

University College,
DUBLIN.

A Constituent College of
The National University of Ireland.

SESSION, 1919-20.

THE College provides Courses for the Degrees of the National University of Ireland in the Faculties of Arts, Philosophy, Celtic Studies, Science, Law Medicine, Engineering and Architecture, and Commerce.

The following Regulations for the College Courses, etc., may be obtained on application :--

1. General Regulations, Scholarships, Fees.
2. Courses for Degrees in Arts, Philosophy, Celtic Studies.
3. Courses for Degrees in Science.
4. Courses for Degrees in Law.
5. Courses for Degrees in Medicine and Dentistry.
6. Courses for Degrees in Engineering and Architecture.
7. Courses for Degrees in Commerce.

College Scholarships and Prizes to the value of about £3,500 (not including Scholarships provided by the Corporation of Dublin and by the County Councils) are open to competition amongst Student-Members of the College.

Letters in reference to Courses of Study should be addressed to the Registrar of the College, Earlsfort Terrace, or to the Medical School, Cecilia Street. All Students' Fees due to the College are to be paid to the SECRETARY, University College, Dublin.

The College Offices at Earlsfort Terrace and in the Medical School, Cecilia Street, are open daily.

Telegrams—"HOSIERY, DUBLIN." Telephone No. 1292.

KENNEDY & McSHARRY

Shirt Makers, Hosiers, Hatters
and General Outfitters, :: ::

24 WESTMORELAND STREET,
—— And 3 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN.

· · FINEST · ·

SMOKING MIXTURES.

NO CHANGE IN . . .
PRE-WAR QUALITY.

JOHN LEASK,

SUCCESSOR TO

GEORGE MITCHELL, Ltd.,

Wine and Cigar Merchants,

9 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN.

Telegrams: "MITCHELL, DUBLIN. Telephone 554.

——FOR HIGH-CLASS——

Cigars, Cigarettes, Fancy Tobaccos, Briar Pipes,
and other Smokers' Requisites—

JOHN PURCELL, LTD., DUBLIN.

Head Office: 16 NORTH EARL STREET.

Branches through the City.

Telephone 1938. Telegrams: "PURCELL, DUBLIN."

You will find it economical to place your orders for

HARDWARE AND IRONMONGERY

with us. We carry a large stock of **Cutlery, Household Utensils, Garden Tools,** and **Builders' Ironmongery.** Quality and price right.

GLEESON, O'DEA & CO., LTD.,

21 & 22 CHRISTCHURCH PLACE, DUBLIN. Telephone: Dublin, 261.

TODD, BURNS & CO.

LIMITED.

High-Class TAILORING

TO ORDER.

SUITS and OVERCOATS

READY TO WEAR.

Gentlemen's OUTFITTING

IN ALL REQUIREMENTS.

Furniture, Carpets, Linoleums

IN BEST QUALITIES.

MARY STREET, DUBLIN.

BEST HOUSE COALS. BEST GAS COKE.

Dublin General Steam Shipping Co.

Limited,

COAL IMPORTERS,

18 D'OLIER STREET, DUBLIN.

Telephone 336 and 402. Telegrams: "WALLSEND," DUBLIN

PLUMBING, HEATING, DRAINAGE.

First Class Work and Personal Supervision.

H. A. O'NEIL,

3 CHELTENHAM PLACE, PORTOBELLO BRIDGE, DUBLIN.

'Phone, Rathmines 486.

MOTOR CYCLES

MANTHORPE & CO.,

The Motor Cycle Specialists,

Sole Agents for **Matchless, Bradbury, Scott, Ariel and Elswick Motor Cycles.**

The largest dealers in Motor Cycles in Ireland. Large expert Staff for repairs to all makes (under personal supervision). Best paid Mechanics in the trade. Large stock of Accessories and spare parts.

Manthorpe & Co.

193 Gt. Brunswick St., DUBLIN.

Telephone 3853.

Telegrams: "WATT, DUBLIN." **Telephone: 4268 DUBLIN.**

GEORGE WATT, LTD.

Engineers and Millwrights,

Soho Works, Bridgefoot Street,

DUBLIN.

Estimates given for Repair and Supply for all Classes of Machinery.

Clerical Tailors.

CLERY'S DUBLIN

Complete Outfitters.

Our Cutters are Specialists in CLERICAL TAILORING.

COLLARS, SHIRTS, UNDERWEAR, STOCKS, HATS, BOOTS, CUFFS, GLOVES, BAGS, &c. : : : :
Sole Agents for the "GLOBE-WERNECKE" BOOKCASES.

ILLUSTRATED CLERICAL LIST ON REQUEST.

CLERY & CO., LTD., DUBLIN.

Vestments and Banners

As a result of the Great War and consequent difficulty of securing Vestment Embroideries from the Continent, we have installed Three New Machines, driven by electricity, and have skilled operators executing most elaborate and elegant Embroidery, equal both in workmanship and price to those heretofore imported from the Continent.
We are anxious for your kind patronage, as we are specialists in Vestments and all materials connected with same.
We will at all times be pleased to submit on approbation, post free, a selection of Vestments, Ornaments, Braids, Fringes and Silks, of which we always carry a large and varied stock.

C. BULL, LTD., 21 Suffolk St., DUBLIN.

KENNEDY'S BREAD

FINEST QUALITY
· · · MADE · · ·

BAKERIES:

124 to 130 GREAT BRITAIN STREET

— AND —

ST. PATRICK'S BAKERY · DUBLIN.

AN ALARMING WATCH

Not a Toy, but a most Reliable Timekeeper.
Can be Set like an Alarm Clock. Rings
Loudly. Luminous Hands and Figures.
The Ideal Clerical Watch. :: :: :: :: ::

. . Excellent Value at £7 . .

GANTER BROS., 63 SOUTH GREAT GEORGE'S ST., DUBLIN.

MUSGRAVE'S

Heating & Ventilating

SPECIALITIES

For Churches, Schools, Public Buildings & Residences.

HOT WATER.—Low Pressure Systems, with Pipes. Ventilating and Non-Ventilating Radiators. Accelerated Circulations (no power required). Small Pipe System. Medium Pressure.

STEAM.—High and Low Pressure. Gravity Return. Exhaust Steam. Atmospheric Vapour.

WARM AIR.—Musgrave's Imperial Heaters. Ventilating Air Warmers. Slow Combustion Ventilating Stoves. Open Fire Ventilating Hospital Stoves.

SUCCESS GUARANTEED.

Experienced persons sent to advise anywhere.

—— Drawings and Estimates submitted. ——

MUSGRAVE & CO., LTD.,

ST. ANN'S IRON WORKS, BELFAST.

42 Deansgate, Manchester; Sardinia House, Kingsway, London, S.W.; 24 Queen Street, Cardiff.

By Royal Warrant
To His Majesty King George V.
To His Late Majesty King Edward VII.

By Special Appointment
To His Excellency The Lord Lieutenant,
And the Officers' Messes throughout Ireland.

McDONOGH & CO.,

VICTUALLERS,

11 & 12 CHATHAM STREET, DUBLIN.

Telephones: 1175 and 4634. Telegrams: "McDonogh, Chatham St., Dublin."

ESTABLISHED 1824.

Thomas, William AND John **Kelly,** **Dublin.**

89, LOWER GARDINER STREET.

Offices: 1 & 2, WESTMORELAND STREET, DUBLIN

(NEXT BANK OF IRELAND).

We respectfully solicit from the HIERARCHY and CLERGY a continuance of their valued patronage for the

Pure Altar Wine,

imported by us for the use of the Altar, and which we have for three generations supplied throughout Ireland, England, and the Colonies.

Price per dozen (Bottles and Carriage included) on application.

2/- per dozen allowed for Altar Wine Bottles when returned in good condition, carriage paid.

In other WINES we hold a large and well-assorted stock, together with the finest SPIRITS, both home and foreign. Lists on application.

As advertisements frequently appear which are likely to confuse our names with those of other firms, intending purchasers should make inquiries as to the addresses and identity of the firms with whom they are dealing.

Telephone 1612. **Telegrams: "Threekays, Dublin."**

1st March, 1917.

ASK FOR——————

RATHBORNE'S . . . .

ALTAR CANDLES

TRADE MARK.

Guaranteed and Stamped

75%, 65% & 25% GENUINE BEESWAX.

SANCTIONED BY THE HIERARCHY.

Irish Bleached Beeswax. Sanctuary and Burning Colza Oils.

Manufactured by . . . **JOHN G. RATHBORNE, LTD.,** [Established A.D. 1488.

Candle Manufacturers, Oil Refiners, Wax Bleachers, &c.,

PHŒNIX CANDLE WORKS and 203 PARNELL ST., DUBLIN.

· The I.A.W.S. ·
Came of Age last Year.

WHAT THE I.A.W.S. IS!

The Irish Agricultural Wholesale Society is a Federation of Irish Co-operative Societies. It is financed, owned and controlled by Co-operative Societies. Its Directors are elected and its policy controlled by them. Founded in 1897 by a few societies, it has to-day the strength of the Irish co-operative movement behind it. It is a co-operative society owned and directed by co-operators.

WHAT THE I.A.W.S. DOES!

The Wholesale Society was established to undertake the wholesale trading of the Irish Co-operative Movement. Twenty-one years ago its sales amounted to £14,500. Last year its sales approximated to £1,000,000. **All the business of the co-operative movement can be done by the Wholesale Society. BANKING, AGRICULTURAL and DOMESTIC SUPPLIES, DAIRY, AGRICULTURAL and MILLING ENGINEERING.** Ask the Wholesale to quote for your requirements.

WHAT THE I.A.W.S. CAN DO!

By organising trade and finance the Wholesale Society is in a position to aid, as no other organisation in the country can aid, the industrial development of our country. Our industries can be developed and controlled co-operatively. In this all can help by joining a Co-operative Society.

SCHOOLS, COLLEGES AND COMMUNITIES CATERED FOR.
ASK FOR QUOTATIONS and PRICE LISTS.

Irish Agricultural Wholesale Society, Ltd.

Head Offices and Bank:

151 THOMAS STREET, DUBLIN.

Telegrams: "PRODUCE, DUBLIN." **Telephones: Dublin 1432 & 3666.**

ROYAL

WARRANT.

Telegrams: "Poultry, Dublin." "McCabes, Bray." "McCabes, Curragh Camp."
Telephones: Dublin, 2481 (Three Lines). Bray, 22, Curragh, 7.

McCABES,

His Majesty's Fishmongers and Poulterers.

Fresh Daily Arrivals. Choicest Quality.
Fish, Poultry and Game, as in Season.

SOUTH CITY MARKETS, 11 RATHGAR ROAD,
48 UPPER BAGGOT ST., DUBLIN. And Branches.

HOUSE DECORATION

IN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

Private Residences Inspected and Tenders furnished Free of Charge

FOR . . . .

PAINTING, DECORATING, PLUMBING, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, & REPAIRING THROUGHOUT.

THOS. DOCKRELL SONS & CO., LTD.,

South Great George's Street, DUBLIN.

Telephone No. 3330 (4 lines) and private exchange.

WE are now OPEN TO ACCEPT ORDERS for

"LEANDER" MARGARINE.

But we would advise Customers NOT TO STOCK MORE THAN ONE WEEK'S SUPPLY.

TERMS NET. CASH WITH ORDER. WHOLESALE ONLY.

DOWDALL, O'MAHONEY & CO., LTD.,

"LEANDER" WORKS, CORK.

A Bicycle to be Relied on.

THE LUCANIA

will give you good service under all conditions

LISTS POST FREE.

JOHN O'NEILL, South King Street,

AND LUCANIA WORKS, PLEASANTS STREET, DUBLIN.

'Phone 3716 and 3717. Telegrams: "LUCANIA, DUBLIN."

AGENTS ALL OVER IRELAND.

"CALLOX"

IS THE REGISTERED NAME OF THE WONDERFUL NEW DOUBLE WEAR WATERPROOF

CHROME SOLE LEATHER

Made by E. O'CALLAGHAN & SON, LIMITED,

CORK, LIMERICK and BELFAST.

Easy on the Foot—Hard to Wear Out. Light for Ladies—Stout for Men.

Every Sole Stamped "CALLOX."

THE LEATHER FOR CHILDREN, GOLFERS, SPORTSMEN, FARMERS, LABOURERS—in a word, the Leather for Hard Wear and Outdoor Occupations.

IF YOU ONCE TRY IT, YOU WILL NEVER WEAR ANYTHING ELSE.

The Leather World, February 22, 1917, says:—"It is rather difficult to accurately gauge the progress chrome sole is making in popularity, but, as far as our observation goes, it is certainly in the ascendancy. Quite recently we heard a banking friend say he had sent his boots some distance away to be chrome soled, as he had found by experience the wear was twice as good as that of ordinary leather. This was quite a bona-fide testimonial, as obviously our informant had no axe to grind either way."

Sole Agent: E. J. LONG, 16 Capel St. and 5 Upper Stephen St., DUBLIN.

PRINTED BY SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER, DUBLIN.